

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

BV 110 .B76 1851
Brooke, Thomas.
The Lord's day

THE
LORD'S DAY:

ITS
DIVINE AND MORAL OBLIGATION.

BY THE
✓
REV. THOMAS BROOKE, B.A.,

RECTOR OF WISTASTON, NANTWICH; LATE INCUMBENT OF LANE END,
STAFFORDSHIRE.

Author of "Baptismal Regeneration is not the Doctrine of the Holy
Scriptures, nor of the Church of England."

BATH:
BINNS AND GOODWIN.
LONDON: WHITTAKER AND CO.,
EDINBURGH: OLIVER AND BOYD.

1851

BATH: PRINTED BY BENNS AND GOODWIN.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE.
INTRODUCTION	v
I. An inquiry into the necessity and original ap- pointment of a Sabbath, or holy rest	1
II. The intimations in Scripture of an early observance of the Sabbath	24
III. The probable time of the revelation of Genesis.	50
IV. A consideration of the transactions at Marah and Sin.	64
V. On the morality of the Sabbath, and on the pre- scription in the Decalogue	76
VI. Two of the Old Testament predictions of a day of holy rest under the Gospel dispensation examined.	150
VII. The evidence presented in the New Testament of the duty of keeping the Lord's Day as a holy rest.	165
VIII. Observance of the Lord's Day on the authority of the Church	285

INTRODUCTION.

THE occasion of this work arose, about three years ago, in a discussion of its subject at a clerical meeting. I had not anticipated much diversity of opinion ; and was greatly surprised at my error. I have some reason to believe that painful uncertainty is a too common state of mind, even where some degree of consideration has been devoted to the question of the Lord's Day.

The general impression, perhaps, in favour of its sacred observance, may have no better foundation than an early but unenlightened prejudice. This, of course, leaves the mind utterly defenceless against the first

serious and plausible attack. So far as my sphere of observation extends, a desire seems to prevail that the moral and Divine obligation of the Lord's Day might be conclusively established. This, however, is not so easily attained.

When this little book had been written and corrected for the press, I had an opportunity of reading "Jordan's Sabbath of God," 1848. A certain similarity to that work may be observed in this statement. But both may be read, perhaps, concurrently with advantage.

Whilst writing this Introduction, the number of the "Christian Penny Record" for October 27, 1847, sent to me by some unknown hand, was opened. It had been mislaid for some time. Of the works of Wardlaw, King, and Thompson, on this subject, I have not seen more than the extracts contained in this "Record." Circumstances preclude my purchase of modern publications—a disadvantage which is often the subject of regret. I am, however, thankful to see an identity of sentiment with such distinguished members of the Church of Christ.

Whilst the Rev. B. Richings, Vicar of Mancetter, Atherstone, was revising "The Lord's Day," through

the kind mediation of the Rev. F. Storr, Vicar of Acton, I met with some incidental, but important statements, in Perkins—an old author of 1617. They are in the second book of his “Cases of Conscience,” p. 278.

He rests his decision that the day of Pentecost occurred *on the first day* of the week, as Cyril had done long before, on this ground:—“The Jews were commanded to *bring a sheaf of their first-fruits the morrow after the Sabbath of the Passover.*” This is both simple and decisive. It is confirmatory of the statements in this book; also, as to the day of the Passover when our Lord suffered. It indicates with certainty the fifteenth, or first day of the feast, identifying this with their regular Sabbath, and the convocation day of the feast of unleavened bread, constituting it “a *high day.*” It, also, rules the “*count*” for the day of Pentecost. (Lev. xxiii. 10, 11. N.B. 15. Vide p. 260.)

He states the general position of the question in his day:

I.—As contested by the partial sabbatarian in relation to strictness of observance. He does not say

anything about a strife for exclusive observance of the seventh day.

II.—As to the sentiment of those who insisted on a liberty to labour, &c., after the public worship of God, on this day.

III.—As to those who believed, like the majority in our own day, in a Christian liberty on the first day, repudiating, at the same time, all profane and sensual licence in this holy rest.

The case of the first class is dismissed on the ground that the sabbath has ceased as a ceremonial institution with an abolition of the law. For, he distinguishes between the immutable *duty* contained in the fourth commandment, and the *manner* in which this is to be performed. And his argument is exemplified by an instance, where God, as in the commandment, enforced a *temporary* ceremony, by a reason which was *perpetual*—viz., that Levi should not have any inheritance among his brethren, because God was his portion. (Num. xvii. 20.)

The second view is refuted as grounded on a false assumption that all days are alike; the commandment prescribing only the solemn worship of God. But this

were as well done one day as another, were this hypothesis true. The commandment both prescribes rest from labour, and observance of the duties of holiness and religion. It may be added, that it ordains a seventh day for worship, following six days of work ; both when man *shall*, and when he shall *not*, pursue the duties of his ordinary calling.

“And,” Perkins adds, “if it command abstinence from ordinary labour, *a.f.*, from pleasure and recreations.” This constitutes, necessarily, a difference between this day and all others. (See Perkins, 2nd book of “Cases of Conscience,” cap. 16.)

The passages adduced by modern opponents from the Scriptures are precisely those on which ancient disputants relied. (Col. ii. 16 ; Gal. iv. 10 ; Rom. xiv. 5.) It is observed by him on the last, “the Jews’ Sabbath was both the time of the worship of God, and a part of His worship. But the Sabbath of the New Testament, though it be a necessary time of God’s worship, yet, it is not a part thereof.” (Acts. xiii. 14 ; xvi. 13 ; xviii. 3, 4.)

Whilst waiting to complete the list of subscribers, my friend Mr. Storr put into my hands the Seven Sermons

of the Bishop of Calcutta, published when he was Vicar of Islington, 1831, of which I had not even heard. The reader will perceive, possibly, the necessity of mentioning this to obviate misconception, from the humble resemblance to the Bishop's general line of argument in those vigorous and conclusive productions.

Some points, strictly speaking collateral, and not necessarily adduced by opponents to establish the question at issue, have been pursued further than I could have desired; but not further, it is hoped, than was necessary to the justice required by those subjects. It has been far from the wish of the Author to misplace discussions, and distract the reader's attention; for, however important in themselves, they are not all of equal importance to the great subject under consideration. And he cannot but know that the best things are only seen in their full beauty and effect in their proper place.

Two publications have been kept especially in view. The one was published by Robert Burnside, M.A., 1825; the other is called "The Modern Sabbath Examined," 1832. The first endeavours to establish the Sabbatarian view; the second takes the lower ground of

observance of the Lord's Day, viz., the authority of the Church. Burnside's book was not seen by me until the substance of this statement had been collected together. It has been necessary, therefore, to notice various points in his production, as in those of the other authors whom I have mentioned. To me the spirit and vigour of Burnside appear admirable; nor can I but admire, whilst unable to adopt, the arguments of "The Modern Sabbath Examined."

THE LORD'S DAY.

&c.

CHAPTER I.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE NECESSITY AND ORIGINAL
APPOINTMENT OF A SABBATH, OR HOLY REST.

*Prescription of a Sabbath appears necessary to give practical effect
to man's belief in the existence of God.*

THAT God ought to be worshipped and obeyed is a natural truth, self-evident to the mind of man. But this truth is not to be confounded with the *mode* and *time* in which the one, nor the way in which the other of these duties must be performed. Hooker affirms, that "worship of God is an axiom that needs no further proof than the bare statement." (Ecc. Pol. vol. i. p. 147.)

Our duty to fear and honour God flows naturally out of a belief in Him as our Creator and Ruler. These two principles, indeed, constitute the foundation of worship; and are inseparable from faith in His being, and our natural relation to God. Wherever, therefore, man

has acknowledged the one true God, or set up a false God, worship of this object of belief has been invariably instituted as an evident duty. The conduct of the Athenians is a case in point. (Acts xvii.)

To this common deduction of the human mind, then, the Holy Scriptures appeal. "A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master; if then I be a FATHER, where is mine honour: and if I be a MASTER, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts." (Mal. i. 6; Acts xvii. 23.) See Butler's Analogy, p. 45. "Thus we find," &c. The prophet's appeal on this subject, is one of many in the Holy Scriptures to man's common sense and natural duty.

This appears to be, then, a principle of natural law; inferential, necessarily, by the human mind; an inevitable conclusion from the nature and position of man as to the Creator. But nature itself, and the laws of nature, therefore, as means to a determined end, are expressions of the will of God. "For the heavens declare the glory of God," &c. (Ps. xix.) And hence, Hooker says, "That law, the performance whereof we behold in things natural, is as it were authenticall, or an original draught written in the bosom of God Himself." (Ecc. Pol. vol. i., p. 132.)

Our Lord Jesus Christ, therefore, represents the provisions for God's acceptable worship, as a leading object in the Divine mind. "The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain nor at Jerusalem worship the Father. . . . When the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a spirit, and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth." (John iv. 21—24.)

1. This is spoken, doubtless, immediately in respect of the Gospel. What is this, however, but a *continuation* of God's dealings in the Church, which is one from beginning to end ; or, "one body !" His great object as to the Church, "which is His fulness," must have been, like Himself, ever the same.

2. Moreover, this object has been the worship of "*the Father*," i.e., in Christ. For, says Jesus, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." It must have been originally, therefore, *puri ratione*, worship of the Father as Creator, at the beginning. And thus, as in nature so in grace, the relation and duty of man towards God are founded upon the same truth, *viz.*, that He is "*Our Father, who is in heaven*."

3. If this worship must be "*in truth*," then, all essential things are included ; as the truth must comprise everything relative to God in His worship. And if *time* necessarily enter into this work, then this must be implied from the beginning.

4. As the ground of worship is laid in the nature of God, so whatever is connected with its acceptable performance, must be resolvable into the same principle, and arise in His will as its source, and be necessarily immutable like Himself. Although the duty itself, then, be natural and moral, yet the *way* and *time* never could have suggested themselves to the mind of man, but must have been always suspended on the will of God. And in this arise the *necessity* and *morality* of a Divine prescription, as to these indispensable adjuncts to Divine worship. Moreover, since worship relates to the Church as a body consisting of many members, all naturally fallen from original perfection, no union, nor certainty, nor even probability

of its being done at all, could have existed without an imperative and infallible rule.

This is implied, therefore, in the expression "*seeketh*." When our Lord spoke of this object and dealing of God, His worship had been secured through divinely-appointed and complete means, extrinsic to man, and this from the very beginning, as will be seen. And these means when revealed were, and still remain, incomprehensible to man. And what, indeed, is all revelation of truth but the "*seeking*" of man by God to all the purposes of His revelation? "For who knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God."

5. And, finally, it appears that everything connected with the worship of God is to be of His own appointment; man "*MUST worship Him in spirit and in truth*." There *must* be the right *measure*, and the right *way*, as well as the sincere mind.

Such being the necessity of a prescribed time in the worship of God, we find it, accordingly, at the very beginning. But prescription of a Sabbath appears *necessary* to maintain *consistency*, in the facts recorded in the Scriptures. It forms part of the narrative of creation:—"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the SEVENTH DAY God ended His work which He had made. And God BLESSED the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made." (Gen. ii. 1—3.)

Owen thinks that the third verse would have been more correctly rendered "*because that in it He did rest from all His work which*," &c. For the Septuagint has the verb in the first aorist, and the Hebrew has only the preter-pluperfect tense for the expression of past

time. (Owen on Hebrews, vol ii. p. 302.) But “the first aorist signifies *unlimited time*, and is used to express universal propositions.” (Jones’ Greek Grammar.) The distinction of time, as marked in the authorised version, or in his proposed reading, by a fact altogether passed, would be scarcely so correct as it is in the Septuagint. It would be most appropriately expressed in this form, “*because that in it He HAS rested;*” i.e., in all past time from the beginning, and at the present time which is passing. This indicates a prescription from the very beginning.

As an historical record of *positive fact*, nothing, surely, can be more precise and plain. And yet, in the heat of controversy, how has the narrative been distorted? The history begins with the first day and its work, when the divisions of *night* and *day* were appointed. This designation is affixed independent and anticipatory of that natural measure of time. The inspired historian proceeds in his wonderful narration, from day to day, to the transactions of the *seventh day*. The work of the *third day* assigns the natural measure to a night and day, by the rotatory motion of the earth. There does not appear to be any rational ground of doubt that God’s rest occurred on the seventh day in rotation. Nor is it admissible, as conjectured by Mr. Wright, and quoted by Burnside, but not with favour, that “the first three days differed in length from the four following days, and from each other.” (Chap. ix. p. 273.) Words and their signification, or native meaning, arise together; and the division of time into *night* and *day* occurred on the very *first* day, when to these spaces these terms were attached, and they still remain unchanged. Whether or not this

seventh day were the same in the order of the days of the week, with that seventh day sanctified in the Decalogue, is neither material in itself, nor is it now to be positively ascertained.

A modern author, whose book I have not read, attempts to prove that time was *put back* during the Exode one day ; so that our *first day* is, in fact, the original *seventh day*. Were this indeed the case, it would show that the *principle* of a sabbath was involved in the portion of time sanctified, and not in the precise day. I do not know how that author explains two difficulties arrayed against the position assumed. *First*, the plain assertion of the Decalogue that “the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God ;” when it would be strictly “*a seventh day*.” *Second*, the quiescence of the sun and moon for about a day, recorded by Joshua. This, by protracting the day through the space of a night, would make the sabbath ensuing on the *sixth day*. And it shows again, that God looks at the portion of time, and not at the precise day.

As if it were to bind together in one continuous narrative, the facts relating to the whole seven creative days, the inspired author resumes his account :—“These are the generations (or record) of the heavens and of the earth, when they were made, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens” (Gen. ii. 4) ; evidently implying that their *completion* and the transactions of the seventh day were contemporaneous. Until the solemn consecration and completion of this portion of time to God and man, in the perfection and dedication of all things in the worship of this day, to the Creator’s glory, creation was evidently incomplete. The very spring which was to impart life and direction to the

wonderful machine, so as to secure the great object, was wanting. And this agrees fully with our Lord's declaration that "*the sabbath was made for man.*" It was part of the natural law and covenant of God; and the real object of the division of time into seventh parts, as we shall presently see.

The *Facts* of God's rest on the first seventh day of time, and of an establishment involved in it of six days' work, and one of holy rest in seven to man, appear to be the fundamental points upon which the whole doctrine of the sabbath question is based. The first, happily, is not to be denied. The second I hope to demonstrate.

The rest itself, if both God and man were interested in it, bore a mutual and reciprocal relation as to the day. *To God* it was the seventh day in the order of creation; the holy rest-day of satisfaction in His completed work, and in the full display therein of his glory, but especially of His image in man. Nor could this be but in an active exhibition of the Divine excellency and nature in man's worship of the Creator. The first object of Jehovah! The first act of man! *To man*, it was really the *first day*, the seventh day of *time*: and the portion hallowed, in his first act of a sacred rest, in and with God. And, there might be indicated in this double and reciprocal relation of the day to God and man, a predictive unity of counsel and operation, as to the seventh day of the *old*, and the first day of the *new* creation. We are assured that the record of creation is an object of faith. If, then, man had an interest in the record of the *six days*, why not in that of the *seventh*? If this were always an object of belief, it must always have existed as a Divine pre-

scription. The work of God, and the rest of God, especially as we shall find man must have participated in this, presented, at least, equal significance as to the duty which he owed to God, from the very beginning.

Nor would the *subsequent literal prescription of the seventh day to Israel at Mount Sinai, constitute this and the Creation-rest institutions of a different nature.*

The one was in Adam the universal law, practicable to all, as the seventh portion of time. But the Sinaitic sabbath of the *seventh day* was a special and temporary law to God's peculiar people; and like the body of Mosaic institutions, an adaptation of the natural sabbatical law to that people, for the *time being*, and practicable to them in both senses under their dispensation. It was evidently part of their worship to keep the sabbath on *the seventh day*.

Not that I think *the seventh day* did not in any sense enter into the original appointment, *because* it was impossible that it could be precisely and universally observed; but because it was not alone the seventh day. Other and important truths were comprised in this day. It was one of the original divisions of time into seventh parts, the duration assigned to each portion of the works of creation in order; the *first* of such divisions marked in the act of both God and man; and peculiar to this day and portion alone.

It is also referred to as having a place and inviolable relation in the order and covenant of nature. For Jehovah speaks of "His covenant with the day, and with the night," these constituting together the portion originally severed, dedicated, and observed, in natural

worship ; and described as immutable, like the covenant of His grace. (Jer. xxxiii. 20, 21.) But, why not with the month and year, perfected by the revolutions productive of the day and night, had not *this* a peculiar and emphatic meaning ?

“There never was,” says Owen, “any covenant between God and man, but it had some ordinances, or arbitrary institutions of external Divine worship annexed to it.”—(Vol. VI. p. 198. Obs. II. Heb. ix. 1.) Is it not plain that this natural arrangement of day and night entered into the covenant ? And *how* but relatively to the worship of God, especially as the bodies in the heavenly firmament were appointed “signs” of that covenant ? Surely such a leading fact as God’s rest “on the seventh day,” and His sanctification of it, bore relation to *man*, and was comprised in the covenant of Nature, as indicating and prescribing the perfection to be maintained and established by holy fellowship with the Lord. And does not this seem more especially true as this fact of God’s rest was laid in the Decalogue as the natural basis of the Sabbath ? And this, when the law of nature was in course of adaptation to the law and covenant of Moses ? And when, moreover, this covenant comprised the whole decalogue in its conditions ? Hence, surely, the source of sabbatizing was both original and perpetual. This language as to the night and day, would only be intelligible in relation to the prescription of a sabbath. For, immediately that light and the earth were called into being, this elementary division which was to regulate man’s employment of time and God’s worship, was defined. This necessarily preceded the first covenant, which the prophet pronounces equally inviolable with the second ;

and involves man in its conditions, as one of the two parties engaged. I know that "it has been denominated by the author of "The Modern Sabbath Examined," "an extraordinary dogma, constituting one portion of time more holy than another."

In this *natural* arrangement the general principle and root of everything relative to it is involved. Let it be shown to what but the first covenant, and a seventh sabbatical portion of time, Jeremiah can refer, thus secured by the natural succession of night and day. "In all parts of knowledge," says Hooker, "rightly so termed, things most general are most strong. Thus, it must be, inasmuch as the certainty of our persuasion touching particulars dependeth altogether on the credit of those generalities out of which they flow." (Ecc. Pol. Vol. I., p. 197.) It will be seen that this division is the natural regulator, so to speak, of the movements of the heavenly bodies relatively to our planet ; and indicative of the great business of time in regard to man. (See Keith's Lectures, ix. 90, on the globes. v. 150. Vince's Astronomy.) The difference between the mean and periodic times of the moon's motion, or between the space from new moon to new moon, and that of a revolution round our earth, neither of which periods is divisible by seven, made it impossible for man to see in *those* the duty of sabbatical observance. But he would be reminded *daily* of the portion devoted both to temporal and spiritual objects by the appointment of God. For *the sign* relates to the *principle* of the institution ; and hence the prophet connects this with the natural covenant.

The attribute of perfection universally, and in all ages, attached to the number seven, as it must have arisen

in some common source, so is it found throughout the Scriptures; and it is most naturally ascribed to this original prescription of a sabbath. Selection of this portion of time for the rest and worship of God on the perfection of all things, involves evidently, some principle of mysterious perfection in the relations of the Church to God. (Prov. ix. 1; Ezek. xl. 22, 26; Zech. iii. 8—10; Rev. xv. 8; x. 7; xi. 15.)

Specific laws prescribed the way in which all creation was to subserve the Creator's design. (Psa. cxlv. 10; Ephes. i. 3; Exo. xxxiv. 17.) Nor is it justifiable to believe that knowledge of this was either intuitive in man in any important point, or, that there was any exception of anything relative to the worship of God. On the creation of the woman, the design of God is narrated as if it were intuitively perceived by the man. But we are informed that it was supernaturally revealed: "He which made them male and female," *i.e.* God Himself "said," &c. Adam spoke what had been revealed; and could only be known, indeed, by revelation.

The division of time into *seventh parts* was *prior* to the *seventh day*; and this was consequently an effect of that original act of God. And the very first completed portion was both occupied by the rest of God—and if as the *sabbath* made *for man*, by the rest of man, as will be seen. As some *good end* is necessarily proposed in all the doings of God, and as His rest was that which actually occurred in the first completion of the seven portions into which time had been divided; so this must have been the *end* originally designed. (Burnside, 148, 149.) Its appropriation in this way must have originated such a division, as fruit is origi-

nated in the seed. He “declares the end from the beginning.” (Isa. xlv. 10.) Whilst each day’s portion of the creation was proclaimed to be “*good*,” and the completed *whole* to be “*very good*,” suitable to the office, proper to each part, and all so arranged as to ensure the grand design, there is a marked *distinction* as to the day of holy rest and its peculiar work. “*And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it,*” as well as rested from all His work which he had *created and made*. Here is evidently a *solemn law* prescribed, relative to the *separation and dedication* of it to His rest. These things are all implied ; viz., *separation* of this day from the six days of the week ; *dedication* of it to the rest of God : and, as will be seen, also to the rest of man.

Sanctification occurs five hundred times in the Scriptures to signify separation. This is observed by an old writer, whose name I do not remember.

This blessing is not the mere declaration of an inherent good, although this would yet imply some good end, any more than the rest is a mere quiescence as to God, or a mere vacuity as to man. Man and all things were made what they were, and the blessing then pronounced on him and the other animate creatures of God. (Heb. vii. 7.) “The less is blessed of the better,” is the principle marked by St. Paul in the blessing of Abraham by Melchisedek. It proclaims *dependence* on the superior for some good involved in the blessing. The blessing of Jesus effected the miracles by which multitudes were fed. Whilst, therefore, His blessing was *the law* by which the perpetuation of animate creatures in kind, to the various uses and happiness of natural life was secured, nothing of the kind is said of inanimate crea-

tion. This *blessing of the seventh day*, then stands out in remarkable exception ; and was a *law* evidently to secure some great, special, and holy design as to *man*, by his employment of the day in harmony with the rest of God on that day. The *blessing* was an act of sovereign power exercised by God ; and the *sanctification* a religious act in relation to man in his worship of God, expressive of *dependence* upon God for the benefits that were to result from this worship. “Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily, my Sabbaths ye shall keep : for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.” (Exo. xxxi. 13.) So it must have been at the beginning ; for the principles of God’s truth cannot change. This explains how this day, above all others, is “*honourable*,” and why God denominates it, pre-eminently, “MY HOLY DAY.” (Ephes. v. 28—33 ; Gen. i. 26—30 ; Heb. iv. 5—9.)

This harmonizes, likewise, with the prescription of laws for the discharge of all the other duties of man. And strange would it be that he should be directed by prescribed rules in *everything* but that which is the great object of the Divine mind !

This blessing of Adam would have descended in all its privileges and happiness upon all men, had he stood in his primitive estate, as “*the first man*,” and head of the human race. But the principles of all natural law, and the essential good of the original blessing, have been transferred to Him, “the second man,” “whom God hath set to be blessings.” (Psa. xxi. 6, margin ; Psa. xxxii. 1, 2 ; Rom. iv. 6—8.) And hence, when all the seed are gathered together in one, the *effect* is ascribed to the plainly analogous cause. “Come, ye

blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (Matt. xxv. 34.) The primary object of Jehovah thus secured, this prescription of a day of holy rest in and with the Lord proclaims to the whole creation, in the language of the inspired Psalmist,

"PRAISE YE THE LORD,"

the anthem of Adam, and of all the sons of God, ascribing, "Glory to God in the highest !"

It is observable that a *throne* cabalistically represented by the letter S, signifies *rest* ; and this might originate probably in this rest of the great Creator ! And as this rest embraced a day, so did it prescribe the seventh portion of all time. The original reason would recur at each return of the day, and this severance become immutable and sacred, as implied in the Decalogue ; and on the same principle as in all other things once consecrated to the Lord. (Lev. xxvii. 10.)

Now, either man rested with God, or he did not. How could he be employed otherwise ? Why should a prescription be given to direct him in his occupation of the six days, and none whatever on the seventh ? And this might be asked emphatically, were each of those seven days, as Faber maintains, a thousand years ? Man was created in the image of God, and had originally personal fellowship with Jehovah. As he could not employ the very first portion of his life more appropriately than in the worship of God, so does it seem most unreasonable to suppose that his first acts would be not in conformity, but in contradiction to those of God ! For it cannot be supposed that this rest was *doing nothing*. The rest of Jehovah was in the satisfied

contemplation of His works ; the rest of man in the satisfied contemplation and worship of the perfections of his Creator !

It will become opponents, surely, to show how he could be otherwise employed, especially when there are marked traces of his personal intercourse with the Creator, and specific directions in all other things. (Gen. ii.) Were there not a sabbatical prescription he must have been without restraint in his allotted daily employment, destitute of toil and pain, and full of rational delight ; in direct opposition to the system, in everything but the great thing of all, the worship of God ! As he would then have been on this day, independent of the will of God, so would this have constituted him a god to himself.

It appears, evident, therefore, that man *did* rest with God on the seventh day. And this agrees with the declaration of our Lord, that “ the Sabbath was made for man,” (Mark ii. 27, 28.) or, as it is literally, “ *for the man.*” When man is not spoken of in his relation as federal head, neither is the article, nor the same word always used ; e.g., “ man is not of woman, but woman is of man.” (1 Cor. xi. 8—11.) In another passage also the same word is used with the same meaning.—The phrase of our Lord is applied to Adam in one of his first acts as head. “ The Lord God brought them unto man.” (Gen. ii. 19. marg.) The preposition also seems to intimate that the appointment was for the observance of “ *the man.*”

The intermediate step in our Lord’s argument on the sabbath, of which this assertion forms a part, must be supplied so as to lead with certainty from the premises to the conclusion, to harmonize with the

context, and with passages of the same import. (Mark ii. 27, 28.)

“*The Sabbath was made for the man.*” But the Son of Man is Lord of the man, as He is David’s Jehovah. “Therefore, He is Lord of all things made for the man ; and “Lord also of the Sabbath day.”

This is in agreement with St. Paul’s declaration, that “He hath all things put under Him, and is Head over all things to His Church, which is the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.” (Eph. i. 21—23.) Jesus assigned the same reason in justification of His command to the restored paralytic at Bethesda ; and in proof of His right to prescribe, and define the duties proper to the Sabbath, as well as to its sovereign *appointment*. “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.” (John vi. 17, 18 ; viii. 59.) The Jews plainly understood this as a claim to equality with God, and proceeded to seek His life as a blasphemer. But it implies not the *right*, merely, to act as God the Father did ; it implies also the *necessity* to vindicate His claim as God in relation to *the Sabbath* ; or, in an analogy between His own works, rest, and sovereignty, and the Father’s of old, by authoritative explanations of the nature and design of the Sabbath, as its Author, and by restoration of its duties to conformity with the real principles of the Institution. As He refers to its *origin* in relation to the federal head of man, so does He claim our faith in its *permanence* through His own authority and headship over all His seed, and their institutions for the worship of God. For as this authority was both original and permanent, so must the institution be, over which the right is claimed. Admit an appointment of a holy Gospel rest, and

transference to it of an original Sabbath by Jesus ; and there is at once both a proof and complete exposition of this assertion of our Lord ; embracing all time.

If, as it is positively said, the Sabbath originated at Sinai, and terminated with the Mosaic institutions, this would also determine the authority thus claimed over the prescription, and leave no basis on which it could rest under the Gospel, as the power of the Church, and authority of its ordinances, emanate wholly from Jesus. God's satisfaction in man implies a complacency in his first acts ; and this is exemplified in Adam's exercise of supremacy over the creatures. It is said of Enoch that he "had this testimony that he pleased God." Much more would man possess this before sin had defaced God's image in the soul. And it is evident in the narrative of the worship of Cain and Abel, that there was some mode in which this *was* testified to the worshipper, independent of oral revelation. It is connected in Enoch's case with his "*walk with God.*" But, "how can two walk together except they be agreed ?" Their mind, way, and object must be the same. It is plain, consequently, that man *did* rest with God. To understand this blessing as of exclusive relation to a *portion of time* abstractedly considered, is not our absurdity ; but must be theirs, surely, who would separate man from all interest in this undeniable rest of God, and from the prescription of a determinate portion of his whole life to the Divine worship.

The institution of a Sabbath, then, arose in the completion of the works of Creation, and in the rest of God on the seventh day. In this way alone could practical effect be given to the natural suggestion of the human mind ; and consistency maintained in the body

of facts revealed relative to the duty of man generally, as well as to the worship of Jehovah. It was the original sign of that bond which united man in fellowship with God and with his brother. But to dislocate these two verses, in which this appointment is recorded at the completion of God's works, and understand them as connected alone with events at a distance of 2500 years, on *the conjectural and unexampled licence of a figure of speech*, is not unnatural alone, but shows, surely, how far removed from rational support that argument must be which requires such unseemly violence. (Job. i. 10 ; ii. 11 ; Heb. xi. 3.) And this appears more particularly, when, in the Decalogue to which our opponents attach this narrative of fact, it is laid, as the very spring and fountain of the Sabbath, that *God rested on the seventh day at the beginning*. As if this fact in which the Sabbath is asserted to arise, when the covenant of Nature was being adapted to the Mosaic law, were not an equal reason for the prescription to all men in Adam, as it was to the Jews ! Well might it be said by the Bishop of Calcutta, "How men of gravity could ever persuade themselves that a narrative so express was merely inserted by a figure of speech, whilst the Sabbath was never, in fact, heard of till 2500 years afterwards, is one of those startling positions for which the perverseness of man's fallen nature can alone account." (Sermon i. p. 7.)

These Sermons are dated 1831. "The Modern Sabbath Examined" bears date 1832. I cannot see that the Bishop's Sermons are once named in this work. Prominence is given to this imaginary prolepsis, which is not indeed novel ; whilst the decisive refu-

tations by the Bishop, of this and other glosses with which the Jews of old overlaid this merciful institution, appear to be overlooked ! It was very satisfactory to me to find my view of the command to the paralytic at Bethesda, as will be seen, so entirely confirmed. It was not any violation of the law in itself. This notion was founded on corrupt Jewish tradition. (Owen on Heb. Vol. II. p. 300. Scott's Comments on Exod. xx.)

Such insuperable difficulties confront this supposed anticipatory figure, that it has more an appearance of confident assertion, than of rational demonstration. (Pastoral Address to Wilson's Seven Sermons, p. 16.) The *rest of God* was undeniably at the beginning. The *blessing, separation, and dedication* of the day, are narrated as simultaneous acts with His rest ; and the blessing, especially, harmonises with the Divine procedure throughout the whole work of Creation. A contemporaneous prescription of the seventh part of time as a holy rest to man, is in precise agreement with our Lord's assertion as to the Sabbath. The whole of these acts relative to the day, are, besides, expressly ascribed to the rest of God, "BECAUSE *that in it*," &c. The mode of expression would, on our opponents' hypothesis, have run thus, "God blesses the seventh day, and sanctifies," &c. The Bishop of Calcutta makes the same observation. The whole reads so naturally as a continuous narrative of facts occurring in immediate succession, that a violation of this harmony is decidedly *suspicious*, and a most dangerous precedent of liberty taken with statements of fact resting on the authority of God. And when not the slightest *proof* can be given that the Sinaitic law had been promulgated at all, when this inspired account was written. I hope to

show, indeed, a strong probability that the reverse is the fact. The *authorship* of the Book is not by any means infallibly ascertained. Nay, internal evidence is not wanting, that this part was *not* written originally by Moses: "*This is THE BOOK of the generations of ADAM.*" (Gen. v. 1.) Here seems to be the proper termination of the fourth chapter. It appears certainly very like the verification both of the *writer* and *title* of this part of Genesis. "The Book of the generations," or genealogy, or record, of Adam. (vide page 54.) The narrative of Adam's age and death, written of course by another hand, instantly follows. With this chapter another *roll* naturally begins, recorded probably by Noah. "In the day," &c. In the same way this is closed with a record of Noah's death, followed by the narrative of his sons instantly on a relation of that event. (This is a suggestion of an old friend, Dr. Vale, Rector of Longton, Staff.)

The passage in the 2nd of Genesis as to the Sabbath has peculiar features, and which do not show any affinity to the ceremonial character of all law subsequent to the fall. Ceremonies indicative of sanctification, could not have any place where man's state and nature were actually "Holiness to the Lord." (Gen. ii. 25; Eph. v. 31, 32.) The law of marriage seems to have become ceremonial only to fallen man. But each institution, doubtless, remains essentially unchanged. For Jesus appeals to the law of nature as to marriage in this very view. These appeals of the Saviour to *natural truth* are proofs of its immutable nature, and perpetual obligation. Prescription of the *time* and *mode* in which man's natural conceptions of his duty to worship and serve the Lord are directed, seems in precise

analogy with these directions of the Spirit as to *natural truth*. These things are appeals to the traces of that intelligent image in which man was created, and discernible amidst the wreck of the fall. The tendency of his natural desires to perfection in all natural things, believed to be good: and his natural wish to perpetuate it, &c., are thus rendered available to spiritual ends under the guidance and influence of the Holy Ghost. (See Hooker. E. P. Vol. I.)

It appears evident, therefore, that the whole narrative relates *to man*, in the federal relation of Adam to all his seed. And hence, this institution is prominent in the narrative from the very beginning. Nor is it probable that any law necessary to the worship of God would be left to the imagination and caprice of man, but as a judicial act. (Psalm lxxxi. 12 ; Deut xii. 8 ; Ezek. xx. 24, 25.)

If a prescription were originally given why must we look for a *repetition*, so as to suspend the great weight of the argument on its supposed absence ? *Repetitions* are intended to assure us of the *certainty* or *necessity* of a fact, not of its existence. They do not and cannot add to its intrinsic authority in any other sense. And, as God does not do anything in vain, so, observance of an institution must necessarily follow prescription ; or the sanction be enforced on its profanation, and which would be found on the record, as in the violated rule of sacrifice by Cain. It appears to be a truth applicable to the Church at all times, not only that a prescription once given could not be more imperative by repetition, but that this might even become an occasion of doubt. This has indeed happened through the sabbatical prescription in the Decalogue, bringing into dispute both

its origin and immutability. It is not likely, as a general truth, and this is marked, undeniably, as to all original law, that *any* principle once established by God would ever be changed. This is the real secret, explanatory of all the fictitious difficulties suggested by human imagination.

“All things are for your sakes,” says St. Paul to the Church. (2 Cor. iv. 15.) This applies to records of all things by the Spirit (1 Cor. x. 11) ; and implies uniformity in the dealings of God with His Church. (Psa. xix. 1 ; Rev. iv. 1.) If the heavenly bodies, then, were *a sign* to Adam, these must present still the truth signified to it in this original appointment. But would this be consistent with a prescription of the portion of time as *originally divided*, and maintained in God’s rest with man as the federal head, for worship in the intermediate state of His Church, and this state *embracing it on either side* ; and *absence* of such an ordinance on moral grounds, during the larger portion of its existence in the world ? And, more especially, when no such peculiarity can be pointed out in any other important matter ; and when the same portion of time has been observed for worship throughout the Gospel dispensation from its beginning ? As a Sabbath was the sign and means expressly appointed of the holiness of God’s people, so was it doubtless in the patriarchal dispensation ; and it remains to us under the Gospel of Jesus Christ. (Exod. xxxi. 13 ; Ezek. xx. 12—20 ; Isa. lviii. 13, 14.)

Nor would it be any sufficient answer to say that *every day* of the life of man in his primæval condition was employed in worship which would not prove every day to have been *a Sabbath*, any more than that every day was the rest of God. The *principle* involved in this

daily duty was applicable to him after the fall, and an appointment of the Jewish Sabbath. It is a duty incumbent on all Christians at this moment, and on the same ground. (Deut. vi. 4—9 ; Prov. iii. 6 ; 1 Cor. x. 31.)

It is to be concluded, therefore, from the nature of things, plain assertions in the earliest inspired records, rational inferences from undeniable facts, and the analogies of faith and worship, that a day of holy rest was necessarily appointed to man from the beginning.

Man, having lost the Image, and therefore the Spirit of God by sin, and having been banished from his Creator's presence, was left *chiefly* to tradition for the maintenance of religious truth, and worship. (Eph. iv. 24 ; Col. iii. 10.) The chain of communication from Adam to Noah was miraculously preserved in the true Church by seven persons, according to Scott ; and according to Burnside (chap. v. p. 73) by four or five. Brown gives the series thus in his dictionary of the Bible ;—*Adam, Methuselah, Shem, Isaac, Levi* the grandfather of Moses. The deluge is an appalling proof of the corruptions of truth, and of that pollution by sin which has pervaded mankind. (Word Gen. Ex. vi. 20.) In Genesis the essentials of religious worship are recorded. But, as God was securing through Moses an imperishable record of His will in all substantial truth, so it seems consistent with this design to compress into a few chapters the history of centuries which had passed away with those to whom the record bore primary relation. However "scanty" it may appear, yet was it ample through His grace, combined with extraordinary communications occasionally vouchsafed, both for the passing exigencies of His church, and the formation of holy men "*who being dead yet speak*" to the household of God.

CHAPTER II.

THE INTIMATIONS IN SCRIPTURE OF AN EARLY OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH.

IMMEDIATELY after man's banishment from God's presence for sin we find brief but indisputable records relative to worship. The covering of human device needful to the conscious sinner was exchanged for what is significantly declared to be "*made by the Lord God.*" (Gen. iii. 7, 21.) The promise of redemption had been graciously given. (verse 15.) And this appears to have been embodied, through these figurative representations of man's wants and hopes, in the great doctrines of his recovery by sacrifice, or, satisfaction by payment of the penalty originally inflicted ; and the covering of sin imputed, by faith in the blood and imputed righteousness of the victim which was to be offered ;—the promised "*seed of the woman.*"

We then find the record of an act of worship divinely instituted, because sanctioned by the Lord Himself.

"And Adam knew Eve his wife ; and she conceived

and bare Cain, and said, "I have gotten a man from the Lord (I have acquired a man even Jehovah)." (Scott on Gen. iv. 1—7.)

"And she again bare his brother Abel. And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground. And in process of time (margin, at the end of days) it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering to the Lord. And Abel he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect to Abel and his offering, but unto Cain and his offering he had not respect.

"And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. And the Lord said unto Cain why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him."

How much is concentrated in this short and simple narrative of the worship of God!

1. The nature of the required offering, and known necessarily by prescription; the firstling, or head of the whole.

2. The *blood* of the victim, and not the fruits of the ground; or, what God alone can provide.

3. *Perfection* of the victim, the *fat*.

4. *Conformity to the rule prescribed*, implied in the way of doing good, as opposed to that of evil.

5. *The presence of the Judge*; and His testimony of acceptance. (Heb. xi. 4, 5.)

6. *The spirit indispensable* to the worshipper.

7. And, what is immediately apposite to my subject, *the time when this offering was made*:—it was, "at the end of days." (vide margin.)

It is, indeed, true that this phrase was used subsequently to express a short and indefinite time :—as we say, “in about a week ;” “this day se’n-night,” &c. And did this expression stand alone, little more perhaps could be said of it than of many other phrases in popular usage. But in all cases the origin and subsequent application of phrases may be very different things. Those just named, and common among ourselves, originate in the measure of time by weeks, or of a space comprised in seven nights and days.

But this does not touch the reason of such a division of time into weeks, and much less that of computing seven days and nights by seven nights alone. The mind never recurs to the origin of the last and most remarkable phrase, and which is the very form of expression in the first chapter of Genesis, in assigning an original and primary measure of time, and in designating the very first day. (Gen. i. 1 ; ii. 1—3 ; xxix. 27.) And thus Daniel speaks of the “evening morning.” Hesiod, the oldest Greek poet, gives precedence to the night, in speaking of so many *nights* and *days*. The Gauls and Germans counted times and seasons by the number of nights not of days, as appears from Cæsar and Tacitus. In old French *anuit* signifies *to-day*. In English *seven-night*—*fortnight*, mean seven days, and fourteen days. (Hales’ Chron. vol. I. p. 110.)

These expressions, then, “at the end of days,” used in connection with an act of worship, in which there was an evident concert and consent as to the *time* alone ; a fatal dissent of Cain in all other things ; and God’s undeniable sanction of Abel in the whole service, appear to lead, inevitably, to the belief of a *set time* of public worship. And why indeed should the *time*, any more than

the *mode*, be at man's free and independent choice? Look at the melancholy varieties of human opinion in non-essential matters, under a revelation in all points complete! Cain's presumption as to the real significance and mode of sacrifice; his ignorance or contempt of the right spirit of the worshipper, and his impenitence, ensured his final rejection. And let there be borne in mind the strict rules prescribed by Moses, even as to free-will offerings, and all other things; the jealousy of God as to any infraction of these, involving as they do an inflexible maintenance of His prerogative in His worship, independent of their general representative and predictive character; and showing man's utter ignorance of that which is essential to his acceptance in these things. And hence the apostle says, generally, that "the law is for the lawless." (1 Tim. i. 9--11.)

Now, the seventh day would answer to this phrase, "*the end of days*." And so will it be said would the fourteenth and twenty-eighth; and they are doubtless included. But there is *this fact* indisputably connected with the *seventh day*, and no other, that God rested on this day and that this was the *first end of days* at the beginning, and the natural origin of the phrase.

In exact consistency with a prescription of the *time* to be devoted to God's worship, we find an original appointment as to the *offering* which was to be presented. In Noah's day a law determined what animals should be considered *clean and unclean* in the sacrifices to God, and in the food of man. And yet we do not find any literal prescription of sacrifice in the worship of God! These animals were distributed into classes of *sevens* and of *twos*. We do not pretend to account for this with precision. It is known, however, that a

seventh day was appropriated by God, as expressive of this principle, viz. *the perfection of all things under the Covenant of nature including man as the federal head.* The principle of uncleanness, originating in sin, flowed from the two progenitors of the human race ; thus emblematically represented, perhaps, by these provisions in the law of sacrifice, indicative both of the necessity and way of purification from natural pollution. (Gen. vii. 2. ; viii. 20.) And we find Balaam, who could not have derived his knowledge from the Israelites, acting upon this law. Besides, it is a fact, patent on the face of the history, that divine communications were not confined exclusively to the descendants of Abraham.

But, in addition to this, we find Noah on his entrance into the ark, during the whole refuge there, and on his departure, paying invariable attention to this division of time into portions of seven days ; selecting the seventh day for acts expressive of what may be readily discerned to have been concomitant of worship. And one of these acts, on his departure from the ark, was attended instantly by a solemn offering of sacrifice, and this too on the seventh day. If this be substantiated, as it will be from scriptural records of facts connected with the Deluge, the question of an original sabbath will stand on ground not easily to be shaken.

Now, the day of Noah's entrance into the ark, was "the tenth day of the second month." (Gen. vii. 11.) But if the seventeenth day of this month were the sabbath, as will be shown from the narrative itself, then the first sabbath of this year of the deluge, was on the fifth day of the first month.

My simple desire throughout this whole statement, is

to rest every argument on the foundation of scriptural records, fairly and candidly considered, leaning on the overruling guidance of the Holy Spirit, according to the promise "He shall guide you into all truth." It is very unimportant whose may be the view in which any inquiry shall terminate, so that it be in God's truth. Surely, it is not presumption to seek always in all our inquiries into the things of God a realization of the Saviour's promise in their result. Nay, is it not in keeping with the leading characteristic of our dispensation, which is emphatically the dispensation of the Spirit? (Rev. x. 7, 8; 1 John. ii. 20, 27.) Many times, and with much encouragement, have I read the reflection of good old Owen at the close of his elaborate commentary on the Hebrews. "I do therefore here with all humility and sense of my own weakness and utter disability for so great a work, thankfully own the guidance and assistance which have been given me in the interpretation of it, so far as it is, or may be of use to the Church, as a mere effect of sovereign and undeserved grace. From that alone it is, that having many and many a time been at an utter loss as to the mind of the Holy Ghost, and finding no relief in the worthy labours of others, He hath graciously answered my poor weak supplications in supplies of light and evidence of truth." (Vol. vi., p. 507.)

It appears necessary in an inquiry of this kind, to repair, if possible, to the fountain-head. And we *do* find at the very beginning, two points of time distinct from each other, and distinct also relatively to the sabbath.

1. *The beginning of the Creation*, or, of the natural year. From this to the sabbath there intervened a

period of six days, the first sabbath occurring on the seventh day. This appears to enter into sabbatical ordination relatively to the natural year and covenant ; viz., as a recurring holy sabbath on every seventh day ; or, of fifty-two sabbaths in 364 days, with one and a quarter day over. For, this first sabbath was instituted as a seventh portion computed from the first day.

2. *The beginning of that revolution by which the space of day and night, or of twenty-four hours, was measured.* From this to the first sabbath there was a period of *three days* ; leaving 357 of the 360 in the year commencing at that point, and from their appointment as “*signs*,” giving in this sacred year also fifty-two sabbaths, *including the first*. And *this* sabbath of the sacred, or ecclesiastical year, occurred actually on the seventh day of the natural year ; maintaining this pre-determined distinction between natural and spiritual things. In each case it was a seventh part of time. The one appears to indicate, in the rest and satisfaction of God on the seventh day at the Creation, the universal law necessary to secure, celebrate, and perpetuate the perfection of all things, especially of man as their head, under the covenant of nature by a sabbath of holy rest on each recurring seventh day.

The other points to the new church state, consequent on an entrance of sin, shadowed forth under the Mosaic law ; demanding the primitive portion for God’s worship, and for the sanctification of man, although the completion of the work should yet be on the *third*, and not on the *seventh day*, as at the beginning. This provision may indicate that the era of the *third* dispensation will usher in the real *sabbatizing* of the church of God. For let the facts be weighed with attention.

1. The appointment of the bodies in the firmament as *signs*, involving necessarily some important truth signified, of universal and unchangeable interest.

2. The severance from that moment, of the space of 360 days ; the retention of this in the patriarchal Church ; its adaptation to the Mosaic Church ; and its consequent relation, in some sense or other, to the Church of the Gospel dispensation.

3. The *order* of the two provisions ; the one *subsequent* to the other.

Primitive existence of a year of this duration is palpable in the records of the deluge, and certain from its express appointment in the Sinaitic law, as part of the natural law or covenant, adapted generally to the institutions of Moses. (Exo. xii. 2.) As this was the time when the bodies in the firmament were ordained to be *signs*, this moment, and the consequences in which it issued must have been selected to this end ; *i.e.*, to constitute a sacred relation in that period of time towards the Church.

There is here, then, a double view of the year, from the beginning connected with *natural* and *sacred* things. And indeed, all nature was a book of truth sacred to man at the beginning. (Hales' Chron. Vol. i. 326, 327.) So that in the very first year of the world, the *natural year* would enclose a space of 364 days, or fifty-two sabbaths, with a remainder of one day and six hours : and the *sacred year*, 357 days, comprising whole weeks, or fifty-one sabbaths, and the sabbath on the *third* day from an appointment of these *signs* sacred to man ; *i.e.*, fifty-two sabbaths likewise in the sacred period of 360 days.— $357+3$. (Gen. i. 14—19.)

Here, then, appear to have been the original elements in which the patriarchal and Mosaical calculations of

time, relatively to the Sabbath, arose. This may, perhaps, explain the singular retention of the term Sabbath, as synonymous with *week*, and of the expression *seventh*, for the word sabbath, in the very language and phraseology of the Jews, indicating that there was that in it which was both *natural* and *religious*: involving an elementary principle in the worship of God.

Gen. xxix. 27.

Septg. Συντελεστον ἐν ἐβδόμῃ ταυτησ

καὶ δώσω σοι καὶ ταυτην ἀντὶ τῆς ἐργασίας

ἧς ἐργα παρ' ἐμοὶ ἐστὶ ἑπτὰ ἔτη ἕτερα.

Dan. ix. 24. — ἑπτὰ.

xxv. 55. — ἐβδόμῃ.

xxvii. 27. — ἐβδόμῃ.

The same words are used.

Gen. xxix. 27. In Hebrew the two words are precisely the same.

שבוע in both places SBA.

Dan. ix. 24. Seventy weeks=Seventy seventy.

שבועים Both places the same word.

ix. 25, 25. Both places the same word.

ix. 26. ————— the same word.

ix. 27. One week, **שבוע** SBUA.

ix. 27. The midst of the week, the same word.

σαββατον. I have great doubt, if this be an original Greek word. When Demosthenes said, the Oracle Phillippised, he coined a word; and the Greeks appear to me to have coined this word, by adding *on* to the Hebrew **שבת** SBT, "*He had rested.*" (Gen. ii. 3.) So Babel in Hebrew, Babelon in Greek. (Luke xviii. 12.) σαββατον is translated *week*.

Exod. xvi. 22. On the sixth day twice as much.

Exod. xvi. 23. "*To-morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath.*"

Hebr., שַׁבָּתוֹן Grk, Sabbata. Engl., Sabbath.

I believe this is the earliest mention of sabbath for the seventh day. Week appears synonymous with seven, or seventy. (See p. 37.) This is part of the communication mentioned there. Most probably the Septuagint translators retained and fashioned the original Hebrew word for sabbath. And thus, when the Evangelist uses the term *week*, he does it in a Hebraism, by sabbath. For it appears plain that the Greeks, ignorant of such an institution, could not have any ground on which to speak of a week as synonymous with sabbath. (Matt. xxviii. 1, &c.) And thus our word *baptize* is Anglicised Greek.

And hence there was under the law of nature not only a day separated as sacred to the purposes of worship, but the whole year was consecrated to God in rightful occupation, by an appointment of the recurring sabbath : six days to work, a seventh to rest. Noah entered into the Ark on the tenth day of the second month, *which was the sabbath*. (Gen. vii. 4, 10.) For, as just observed, among the Jews, *the seventh* was an ordinary appellation of the sabbath. It is the expression used afterwards as to the seventeenth day : "after seven days ;" margin, "on the seventh day." And this phrase must have been originally the manner of speaking of it, from its entrance into the very structure of their language, and antecedent to the Sinaitic prescription. The language of the inspired narrative is most remarkable : "For yet seven days and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights." As the creation of all things had occupied six days, so the

resolution of all things preparatory to destruction occupied the same time ; showing complacency in the exercise of one attribute of God as well as another. (2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.) "For yet seven days," &c., "and every living substance that I have made will I destroy from off the face of the earth." (Gen. vii. 21, 23.) It is said, therefore, when the judgment predicted was put into execution, "it came to pass (on the seventh day, *margin*) after seven days," *i. e.*, unquestionably on *the seventh*, or sabbath, "that the waters of the flood were on the earth." (Gen. vii. 10.) The day was really the *seventeenth day* of the month, which ordinary expression would have been used, doubtless, as had been done in speaking of the *tenth day*, if the object had been simply to mark the lapse of *seven days*, as named in the predicted judgment. It would have been singular that these periods of seven days, or of a seventh day, should have been *invariably* maintained throughout this narrative had there not been an original dedication of a seventh part of time as holy ; a peculiar propriety in its observance by Noah, whom Peter denominates "the eighth preacher of righteousness ;" (Grk. Test., 2 Pet. ii. 5.) when taking leave of a world of sinners, whom he had warned of approaching destruction for 120 years in vain, and by public confession of the God defied by those sinners. But this is not all. There is a marked repetition of his observance of the same seventh day, in connection with all the leading events which occurred during his abode in the Ark. And, to complete the whole, there is a positive act of worship at the very entrance of the seventh day, when he departed out of the Ark.

It seems likely that the passage recorded in Gen. iv.

24, ought to be rendered "to call," or "preach in," or "of the name of the Lord," as involving in itself the mystery of redemption ; or, as St. John denominates it, "the mystery of God." (Hodges on Job, Preliminary Discourse, p. 2 ; Note from Smith's Essay, A. D. 1694.)

But I now proceed to the more minute examination of the dates and facts recorded as to the Deluge.

The prevalence of the flood on the earth continued 150 days, or five months, of thirty days in each month. It is, therefore, the *ecclesiastical* year which is intended in the narrative. We shall have undeniable proof of this.

It is observable that "the twelve signs of the Zodiac commemorate twelve facts recorded in ancient scripture history, and it is easily demonstrated from the names of the stars in those constellations, and which from all antiquity those stars have borne ; and nothing is more plainly related than the history of Noah.

"*Ras al Asad* in Leo : signifies '*the beginning of the Flood.*' *Peg-assus*, north of Capricorn, signifies '*Rest on dry ground.*' But *Leo* is the *fourth* sign, and *Capricorn* is the *ninth* sign. So that the Flood, according to these signs, occupied *five months*, which is the scripture account.

"Again, Capricorn is *Ary son Pos*, which in the original language will signify, '*The first goat-offerer,*' a sufficient characteristic of Noah. So that the Mosaic prescription of the ceremonial scape-goat was, most probably, only a perpetuation of what had been originally attached to the doctrine of Atonement. And one of the stars in Leo is *Mincha-al-asad* ; or, '*the evening offering at the Flood.*' One of the stars in *Virgo* is *Za Vi Java* ; or, '*The*

Lord was there. And if *Min al Anwa* is short for *Mincha al Anwa*, it signifies ‘*the evening offering on board of the Ark :*’ showing that religious observances obtained in the ark as well as on dry land. If these offerings, then, were made on the sabbath-days, they were made during the whole period of the flood.” (Lectures on the Zodiac, by Rev. B. Vale, LL.D., Rector of Longton, Staffordshire.)

Having had occasion to certify my mind on some points, as I was sending the MSS. to the press, I wrote to the same friend, who sent, among other things, the following curious communications.

“I beg to add $\sigma\alpha\tau\upsilon\rho\alpha$. The heathen venerate SATURN ; and we have our SATURDAY.


“Also Taurus, or Torus, is the first sign of the Zodiac, and is the hieroglyphic for 1 among Egyptians, Chaldees, Hebrews, and Greeks.

T 400	A	1	Now if s be added to TOR, it will make Sator.
O 6	D	4	
R 200	A	1	
—	M	600	
606		—	
		606	

“Showing that Saturn is the same as *Adam*, or Torus.

S 60	T 400	But Torus signifies ‘The first man’s rest,’ be- cause s is a throne and hieroglyphic of rest.
T 400	O 6	
O 6	R 200	
R 200	S 60	
—	—	
666	666	

“Thus the heathen prove Saturday *the first man’s rest.*”
N.B. Rev. xiii. 18.



Gen. viii. 5. The waters decreased continually until the *tenth month*; when, on the *first day of the month*, the tops of the mountains were seen; or *in two months and fourteen days*, or in 74 days.

To this point, then, there had elapsed
150 days and 74 days, or ... 224 days.

Verse 6. The raven was sent out in 40 days
from this ... 40 „
8, 10. The dove was sent out in 7 days, and
returned ... 7 „
11. She was sent out again, and brought
back an olive leaf plucked off ... 7 „
12. She was sent again, and returned not
any more ... 7 „
—285 days.

Gen. viii. 5. Now the above *forty days* would terminate on the
6. 11th day of the 11th month. For they would
comprise 29 days of the 10th month, and 11 days
in the 11th month.

13. The 21 days (three times seven) terminated on the
22nd day of the 12th month; comprising 19 days
in the 11th month, and 2 days in the 12th
month.

And hence, 29 days + 285 days = 314 days.

Gen. viii. 14. In 29 days of the 1st month, + 27 days of 2nd
month = 56 days from a removal of the covering.
Noah left the ark.

But 314 days + 56 days, = 370 days. Add 7 days
for the period between Noah's entrance and the
descent of the flood, and 377 days will be the
whole time of refuge in the ark.

The table is more succinctly as follows :—

Gen. viii. 4.	The ark rested in the 7th month, and 17th day, or in the 5 months, or 150 days. This includes, therefore, the 17th day of the last month, 150 days.	
Verse 5.	The tops of the mountains were seen on 10th month, 1st day, or in	74 days. (13 da. of 7th mo. + 30 da. of 8th mo. + 30th da. of 9th mo. + 1da. of 10th mo.)
7.	The raven was sent forth on 11th day of 11th month, or in	40 days. (29 da. of 10th mo. + 11 da. of 11th mo.)
10, 12.	The dove was sent out the last time, on 22nd day of 12th month, or in	21 days. (19 da. of 11th mo. + 2 da. of 12th mo.)
13.	The covering was removed in the 601st year of Noah, on 1st day of 1st month, or in	29 days. (28 da. of 12th mo. + 1 da. of 1st mo.)
14.	The departure from the ark on 27th day of 2nd month, or in	56 days.
Gen. vii. 10.	Add the time from Noah's entrance into the ark to the descent of the flood	7 days.
		— 377 days, or
	53 Sabbaths, and 6 days.	

Consequently Noah's departure out of the ark was on the 6th day.

This is seen from the following table :—

The 150 days contained 21 Sabbaths and 3 days, extending to the 3rd day of the week.

The 74 or less the addition of 4 days to the 3 for the next Sabbath ... 1

4

”

Or 70 days, contained 10

The 40 days ” 5

”

and 5 days, extending to the 5th day.

The 21 days, & the surplus of 5 days } ” 3

”

and 5 days, extending to the 5th day.

The 29 days, & the surplus of 5 days } ” 4

”

and 6 days, extending to the 6th day.

The 56 days, & the surplus of 6 days } ” 8

”

and 6 days, extending to the 6th day, when Noah left the ark.

— 52 Sabbaths, and 6 days in the ark.

Or 53 Sabbaths and 6 days, inclusive of that on the day of his entrance, which was also the Sabbath.

The following table is founded on the fact that Noah entered into the ark on the sabbath, which was the 10th day of the second month :—

In the 1st month of the 600th year of Noah, there were 4 Sabbaths, and 4 days over.

2nd	”	4	”	6	”
3rd	”	5	”	1	”
4th	”	4	”	3	”
5th	”	4	”	5	”
6th	”	5	”	0	”
7th	”	4	”	2	”
8th	”	4	”	4	”
9th	”	4	”	6	”
10th	”	5	”	1	”
11th	”	4	”	3	”
12th	”	4	”	5	”

— 51 Sabbaths.

	51 Sabbaths.	Da.
In 601st year of Noah ...		
and 1st mo.	5	0
2	3	6
	—	
	59	
Deduct those of the 1st } and 2nd mo., before his } entrance into the ark }	6	
	—	53 Sabbaths, and 6 days, or 377 days, as before.

From the narrative itself, it appears that the ark was emptied, as it had been occupied, in one day ; the altar for worship erected, and the sacrifice offered, most probably, at the very entrance of the sabbath, at six o'clock in the evening. Hales, indeed, *assumes* that the ark was occupied in a week. (Vol. i. p. 48.) But as this was under supernatural direction of God, (Gen. vii. 7—16,) so would be the departure, all proceeding without difficulty or interruption. It seems a hasty assumption that this occupied seven days because of God's declaration to Noah that, "after seven days," *i. e.* as in relation to the resurrection it is said *after three days—on the seventh day*. We are all liable to embrace opinions hastily from various causes ; but especially in such extensive works as Hales' Chronology, and Scott's Commentary. In this it is assumed that miraculous restraint was imposed on the propagation of animals in the ark. But, if they entered in pairs, how could any sacrifice have been offered on the departure of Noah, and much more throughout his habitation there ? It might be so in a qualified, but not in an absolute sense.

In the Mosaic dispensation different periods were instituted for particular purposes (Deut. xv. 1, 2 ; Levit. xxv. ; Exod. xii. ; Deut. xxxi. 10), by multiplication of

a certain space by *seven* ; seven *days* at the feast of unleavened bread ; and seven days from the 14th, with one day added, making the second sabbath, or holy convocation, of that feast, and identical with the second and last meeting of the Gospel Church, with Jesus its Head, on earth, and on "THE LORD'S DAY." Seven times *seven days*, and one day added, brought in the pentecostal feast ; the same reduplication of *years*, with one added, making their jubilee, &c. Some of these find what St. Paul denominates their "*body*" in the gospel, as we shall see at the proper time. And as the whole Mosaic system had its root, or principle, in the law or covenant of nature ; so these things, doubtless, arise in some natural principle involved in the temporary prescription, and which is fulfilled and perpetuated in the gospel.

Now we know that man's appointed term of life is three-score and ten years. (Ps. xc. 10.) If this allotted period be divided into cycles of seven years each, and then considered relatively to the sacred year of 360 days, or the natural year of 365 days and 6 hours, the sabbath recurring in each case every seventh day, it will be found that the seventh part of time instituted for worship is also the seventh part of the whole life of man. I cannot tell whether or not the minds of others may have been directed to this fact in its whole bearing. But it is not impossible that such may be the case.

Cycle of Seven Years in the year of 360 days, a Sabbath recurring on each seventh day.

First year	... 360 ...	51 Sabb. & 3 da.	Add 4 days of the next year for the 1st Sabbath of this year, and so securing a Sabbath each 7th day.
	<u>7</u>	1 „	
Second year	360—4	50 „ and 6 da.	Add 1 of the 3rd year in the cycle.
	<u>7</u>	1 „	
Third year	360—1	51 „ and 2 da.	Add 5 of 4th year.
	<u>7</u>	1 „	
Fourth year	360—5	50 „ and 5 da.	Add 2 of 5th year.
	<u>7</u>	1 „	
Fifth year	360—2	51 „ and 1 da.	Add 6 of 6th year.
	<u>7</u>	1 „	
Sixth year	360—6	50 „ and 4 da.	Add 3 of 7th year.
	<u>7</u>	1 „	
Seventh year	360—3	51 „	the last being on the last day of the 7th year.
	<u>7</u>	—	
360 Sabbaths in the whole cycle.			

Hence, in 70 years, there will be 3,600 sabbaths, or 10 years of sabbaths, or one seventh portion of the whole period, holy to the Lord.

Considering this relatively to the year of 365 days, there are in a cycle of this natural year 5 sabbaths more, or a jubilee of sabbaths in the whole seventy years. And then the believer would go out free from all the power of sin, and enter into his “inheritance, which is incorruptible, undefiled, and which fadeth not away.”

Cycle of seven natural years.

First Year 365 days, will contain 52 Sabbaths, and 1 day.

Second Year 365	„	52 Sabb. and 1 da. + 1 day of 1st year, 2 days over.
7		And so on.

Thus, in the seventh year, there would be seven days over, giving fifty-three sabbaths in the seventh year, when the next cycle would proceed as this began. In the whole cycle there would be 365 sabbaths, and ten years of sabbaths in seventy years, or one-seventh part of life as before, and fifty sabbaths in addition.

There are in the natural year, however, 365 days, 6 hours, 9 minutes, 14 seconds. (Keith's Astron. p. 272.) The six hours amount in seven years to one and three quarter days, or to a week or sabbath in twenty-eight years. If a day were added to the seventh year, making the day after its last sabbath the last day in the year; or an additional sabbath every twenty-eighth year, for the intercalation at the close of each cycle; and the nine minutes, fourteen seconds, intercalated also at the proper time, in the same mode; then correct time would be maintained, and a sabbath observed on each recurring seventh day.

The year of 365 days, 6 hours, 9 minutes, 14 seconds, is the anomolistical, and not the correct tropical year. The Julian or Egyptian solar year, regulating our seasons, is followed in our calendar, comprising 365 days, 6 hours. There is an intercalation in this of a day every fourth year, *i. e.*, a week or sabbath in every fourth cycle of seven years. The true length of the tropical year is 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 48 seconds. Our Calendar, therefore, assumes a greater length of the year than is absolutely correct. But as in one case the surplus of 11 minutes, 12 seconds, would not amount to a day lost but in 129 years, so in this

case the gain could only be very small within an extended period of time ; easily ascertained, and obviated when needful.

In our own adjustment of time the same *principle* prevails, by an addition of seven days, or a sabbath, each year, with an intercalary day every fourth year ; and amounting to a week, or additional sabbath, in four cycles of seven years each ; so maintaining 52 sabbaths in each year, with one day over. Thus the days in the twelve months are $30 \text{ days} + 11 = 330 \text{ days} + 28 \text{ days}$, in February $+ 7 \text{ days}$, for the months having 31 days each ; and making 365 days in the year. These would amount in seven years to 365 sabbaths (fifty-three sabbaths in the seventh year), maintaining the same proportion in the seventy years, viz., one-seventh part of life.

It appears very evident, then, that this division of time into seventh parts is *an original principle* in the Natural, Mosaic, and Gospel economies ; without respect to which a true chronology cannot be maintained. And it is plain that the law of the sabbath is the essential ingredient in this ordination : the regulator of time, and the index to eternity !

Horne gives an account of the practice which obtained among the Jews to bring their sabbatical observance into harmony with the natural and sacred years. "From their civil year," he says, "their jubilees were computed, contracts dated, births registered, and the reigns of their kings recorded." (Introd. pp. 289, 290.) Without attention to this, regularity could not have been maintained in their festivals. Observance of their sabbath secured this original principle, that one-seventh part of man's whole life should be holy to the Lord.

What rational conclusion, then, can be deduced but

that this is the *principle* in which the division of time originated; that it is natural and moral; the basis of the Mosaic sabbath, prior to this institution; and ordained with a view to the worship of God, as all fundamental principles must be prior to those things into the composition of which they enter.

I see that Perkins has some lengthened observations on what is denominated by him "*the Order of Times*," as introductory to his digest of the Old and New Testaments. It well merits a perusal.

In the Bible alone the real origin of the universal sentiment entertained in the world as to the *number seven* is found. (Owen on Hebrews, vol. ii., pp. 283, 311, 317; Jordan's Sabbath of God, p. 114, &c.; Burnside, ch. iv., and Hales' Chronology.) The result of a division of time into seventh parts was adopted by God on its first occurrence, as His holy rest, and man's. There does not appear to be any well-grounded reason for restricting this common sentiment of all ages to the Jews. It is, indeed, apparent enough how desirable such a fact is to their hypothesis who would, with some of the Jewish nation, ascribe the origin of a sabbath to its institution among that people. (Burnside, ch. v., p. 79, "*fulfil her week*.")

The only reasonable inference from this prevalent notion appears to be that there is some common origin; and this so early as to admit of universal extension. And there is not any claim like that preferred by an original sabbath. In the line of Shem original truth passed through a very few persons to Moses, even if the probability of a *written record* existing in the line of the godly seed be dismissed. And the resort of Ham's descendants to the stars for a record of leading facts,

and corrupted perhaps into divine worship of the record, is in good keeping with such a fact. And it is to be supposed that all the sons of Noah would carry with them in their dispersions the same knowledge of this division. This is pursued in Jordan, pp. 113—151 ; and in Owen, vol. ii.

But if there were not any apparent connection of this remarkable notion among men with the sabbath, and if there were not any sabbatical observance recorded until the time of Moses, yet let us examine what degree of importance, if any whatever, may be ascribed to such a fact. The object of a certain tract is to show that as there is not any sabbatical observance *recorded* from Joshua to David, nor any of an observance of circumcision from Joshua to Jeremiah, so, on the same ground, the same conclusion might be deduced. (See Tract 596, Tract Society, p. 6, Rev. A. Thompson, B.A., Edinburgh ; Burnside, ch. vi. 132.) But is this argument decisive, as analogous to that employed in the Sabbath question ?

The Bishop of Calcutta notices this in the same way, and with additional arguments. (Sermon vii.) Burnside names also the same facts, and one of these is mentioned in Brown's Dictionary of the Bible.

But there had been plain and undisputed *prescriptions* of both the sabbath and circumcision within the periods named. The *non-observance* of a law confessedly prescribed, and the *non-existence* of a law not on the record as *observed*, and prescription of which is in dispute, are surely very different things. The question at issue is an *original existence* of sabbatical prescription. But this can never be decided by the fact, were it so, that an early *observance* is not recorded. What those facts

really show seems to be this. That as the *same silence* is found where prescription cannot be disputed, so it would be inconclusive to infer the *non-existence* of a sabbatical law from silence about its *observance*. It may arise in other causes. An institution which had never *existed* could not be recorded as *observed*. But, *non sequitur*, that an institution could never have existed because an observance is not recorded, as in the instances already named. It is in this surely as in sacrifices. Of these we have observances in abundance, but not one syllable of prescription until Moses. And why may not *observance* be inferred as positively from *prescription*, as, *vice versâ*, prescription from observance? For, as to the so-called argument of *prolepsis*, in an inspired narrative of facts, detailed in succession to one another, it appears no better than an instance of that "vanity of vanities," which mortals would invest with the reality of truth, and quite open to any of those severe qualifications, as an opposing opinion, which have been unsparingly heaped upon others by "The Modern Sabbath Examined."

It was part of Cain's sentence that he was to be banished "from the face of God," or "from the faces of God," as "the tree of life" might be denominated "the tree of the living ones." It is remarkable that symbols of the Divine presence were placed in "the holy of holies," or "the holy of the holy ones," in the tabernacle and temple. We find these emblems of the Divine presence sustained throughout the whole scriptures, including the Revelation.

Ezek. i. 4, 28 ; xxviii. 14, 16 ; ix. 3 ; xliii. 3, 4. In the second passage of Ezekiel there seems to be an allusion to Him who covers the sins of His people (Ps.

xxxii. 1, 2 ; Rom. iv. 6, &c.) ; and to that anti-christian system of the mystical Tyre, which makes a merchandise of men's souls, maintaining the merit of good works before God, and even doling out their superabundance, from the treasury of the church, for money ; claiming the prerogative of absolution of sin, as in the place of God ; converting the priest of God into a Canaanite indeed (a merchant), selling that for gain which God bestows "without money, and without price." He was "this anointed cherub, on whom the glory was ; which came from the East ; went to the threshold, and thence into all lands." (Matt. xxiii. 38, 39.) "My name is in Him." (Exod. xxiii. 21.) In these representations, probably, might originate "the teraphim" of Rachel, the "*Dii Penates*" of the heathen, from *Peni*, "heads," or "faces." In allusion to them, possibly, might originate the custom of the Jewish high priest, observed, I believe, to this day, of blessing the people with hands uplifted, and clasped above his head, so disposing of the fingers and thumbs as to present three points upward, emblematical, doubtless, of the sacred Trinity. (Hodges' Elihu, p. 23.) Nor can any valid objection be raised against these things, because of their express appointment by God, excepting the last named.

We are told that on an occasion of special anxiety Rebekah "went to enquire of the Lord" (Gen. xxv. 22), implying that there was some place specially consecrated by the Lord's presence. And, in precise agreement, we find it was the very first thing that Abraham, &c., did, on each removal of residence, however temporary ; and knowing that the settled abode of his posterity was a point in the promised and distant future, to secure a *place* for the worship of God, a place where he stood

before the Lord." (Gen. xix. 27.) And this was perpetuated under the Mosaic dispensation, in evident allusion to pre-existent custom, "and there will I meet with thee," &c. (Exod. xxv. 16—22.) And thus the same idea is still maintained in the apostolic direction to Christians, "Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest," &c. (Heb. x. 19—22.) But how is all this to be reconciled to an *uncertain time*, or to no time appointed at all, in the worship of God? The duty, the altar, the place, the sacrifice, the priest, the covenant, all, in short, but *the time*, prescribed and certain! And all these things opposed chiefly by an alleged figure of speech,—a license unexampled and unparalleled, in a book conspicuous for simple narration of matters of fact! (Owen, vol. ii. 301—307.)

CHAPTER III.

THE PROBABLE TIME OF THE REVELATION OF GENESIS.

To establish that extraordinary position of an anticipation, in the second and third verses of the second chapter of this book, proof appears necessary that it was revealed subsequently to the delivery of the Decalogue on Mount Sinai. *Prolepsis* is anticipation in a narrative of what has actually occurred, but subsequently to the time of which the historian is speaking. "Anticipation is that by which something is told as if it were done, which, notwithstanding, was not done in that time and order as it is told, but afterward ; or it is a relation of a later thing in a former place." (Perkins, vol. ii., p. 678 ; Gen. xiv. 7. It was long after that the name *Kadesh* was given ; the same is true of the well, named in Gen. xvi. 14 ; xxi. 14. See Is. xxxviii. 22 ; 2 Kings xx. 8.) The facts anticipated here are events 2500 years from the Creation, of which the narrative is being recorded. Uncertainty as to the period of revelation destroys the argument arising in

this supposition. If the book, or this portion of it, were *revealed before* the transactions on Mount Sinai, it is not at all likely that these would be simultaneously presented to the writer's mind.

The natural and simple view of the whole narrative is, that it records a series of facts occurring in succession, and on the days to which they are assigned. The subject of this chapter is, in this view, more interesting and curious than important. I could only regret that as this point had not wholly escaped the notice of Owen, it had not been pursued by him, as his usual research and acuteness would have left little more to be said on the subject. (Owen, vol. ii. p. 306.)

Horne says, in his *Compendious Introduction*, p. 376, "the most probable conjecture places it after the departure of the Israelites out of Egypt." This appears vague; as at the best it would make it conjectural, and amount only to *probability*; or that it is more likely than otherwise. I hope to show that the probability is that the revelation preceded the exode.

"Certain it is that the creation, and introduction of sin were recorded by Adam. (Gen. v. 1.)

"The history of Enoch by Noah. (vi. 1.)

"The history of Noah by his sons. (x. 1.)

"The history of Babel by Terah. (xi. 7.)

"The history of Abraham by his sons. (xxv. 12—19.)

"The history of Isaac by Esau. (xxxvi. 1.)

"The history of Esau by Jacob. (xxxvii. 2.)

"The history of Joseph by Moses." (Exod. i. 1.)

B. Vale, LL.D., rector of Longton.

In like manner we read, at the close of Job's answers to his misjudging friends, "the words of Job are ended." And in the same way the compositions of David are

terminated, "the prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended." (Job. xxxi. 40 ; Ps. lxxii. 20.) And why may not Job have written the book bearing his name to this point, as well as the son of Jesse those prayers? Perhaps Elihu might commit the remaining portion to writing. It appears that Elihu was descended from Ram, or Aram, the fifth son of Shem. And this name was preserved in the grandson of Nahor, and in the great grandson of Judah. From Ram the Syrians were descended. Both Hesiod and Homer denominate them *Aramæans*. And in Hebrew *Syria* is *Aram*. (Gen. x. 22 ; xxii. 21 ; Ruth iv. 19 ; Lev. iii. 38 ; 1 Chron. ii. 10.) It appears highly probable, therefore, that the book was written before the call of Abraham, in a generation or two subsequent to Noah. It is very evident that men's attention was directed immediately after the Flood to secure records of leading events, and that whilst in the line of Shem this foresight was connected with the interests of God's truth ; in the posterity of Ham the design was purely historical, and naturally perverted and corrupted into idolatry and superstition.

If the first passage relate to Adam as writer of that portion called "The book of the generations of Adam," there is at once an end of the argument founded on a prolepsis. And, be this as it may, it does not appear reasonable to select of two readings the most difficult, uncommon, and inconsistent with a plain narration of facts. This history of the world and church shews that if sin have inflicted a judicial blindness on the mass of the human race, yet God has never left Himself without a certain testimony of His truth.

Bishop Tomline seems satisfied that the five books, or Pentateuch, were written by Moses in one continued

work ; and they still remain," he says, "in that form in the public copies read in the Jewish synagogue ; although the time of the division, and of prefixing the titles, is unknown." (Elem. Theol., vol. i. p. 5.)

It does not appear absolutely necessary that the *revelation* of Genesis, wholly or in part, to Moses should synchronize with the *writing* ; nor is it pretended to be certain that the entire book was originally revealed to that eminent servant of God. Let those who doubt, especially, as to "*the book of the generations of Adam*," consider how much better the commonly-received *tradition* of authorship is than this, which is patent on the face of the record itself. If it be supposed that the passage relates to what *follows*, and not to what *precedes*, let it be observed, that the next portion opens with a record of Adam's age, of his godly seed, and of his death ; by another hand of course. And even this supposition would separate, were it tenable, the authorship of this and the foregoing portion, whilst in open contradiction as *his* book, and recording his own death.

"*Book.*"

"*Boccho* is old Saxon for *beech-tree*.

"*Book* is abbreviation.

"*Book* is modern orthography, because the Saxons used to write on the inner bark of the beech-tree.

"Thus *liber* is both *book* and *bark*.

"Gen. v. 1. *Biblos* was the Egyptian name of a town, because the plant papyrus grew abundantly in the neighbourhood ; and from this came *papyr*, or *paper*, on which we now write.

"Gen. v. 1. סֵפֶר *Sepher* S. Ph. R., or *cipher*, or *hieroglyphic* applied to a record, because in old times all records were made in *hieroglyphics* ; and a *recorder* was

a *cipherer*, or one who wrote *hieroglyphics*, or *read* or *explained* them. Thus, Judg. vii. 13, "a man *told*," or *ciphered*, or *recorded* "a dream unto his *fellow*."

"N.B. I suppose that, as far as Gen. v. i. was the *book*, or the *record*, or the *ciphering*, or the *hieroglyphicking* of Adam. As we say, '*Thus far*.'"

Benj. Vale.

"N.B. Jer. xlvi. 47, '*Thus far the judgment of Moab*.'" (See page 20.)

Brown, in his Dictionary of the Bible (Word, Genesis), speaks of the period when Genesis was revealed as a disputed point. Reference to the passages cited will show a stronger probability that Moses compiled part of the book from pre-existent records, than that he wrote the whole. Attention was evidently given very early to secure *permanent* records of important facts. Thus we find *Sirius* applied by the Egyptians to maintain a knowledge of the time when the overflow and subsidence of the Nile might be expected. Egypt has been the prolific birth-place of cabalistical science. And what is more likely than that the descendants of Ham, who had abundant opportunity to watch the changing positions of the stars from the Ark, would resort to the stars and hieroglyphics, as a mode of recording passing events, especially in relation to the Deluge.

The *present* form of the Pentateuch among the Jews does not appear to justify any inference whatever as to the time of its *revelation*. For, it is acknowledged, that the period of making this arrangement is unknown. It is observable that whilst the *writing* of Genesis is not mentioned, there is more than one record, under the direction of God, as to the writing of the other books

after the Exode. It is known that the entire book of Revelation was communicated *before* it was written; and that the Gospels were written, under the dictation of the Spirit, long *after* the events, calling to “remembrance all that Jesus had said.” And it would appear, indeed, that it was one of the last acts of the public life of Moses to commit the Law, as recapitulated and explained in Deuteronomy, to writing. (Deut. xxxi. 24, 25, 26.)

It may be observed here, as a circumstance suggestive of several reflections about the book of Job (Job i. 6; ii. 1), which has also been ascribed by some to Moses, that the name of this patriarch was given to one of Issachar’s sons. (Gen. xlv. 13. Job, “*he that weeps.*”) Now Job must have lived before Jacob, and must have been, from this adoption of his name, of some renown. His history, then, must have been known; most probably written. The book of Job might, therefore, have been extant before Moses, as well as that of Adam. It is to be observed that this perpetuation of a name so remarkable as Job’s, was in the very tribe of which it is said distinctively, “the children of Issachar had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do.” (1 Chron. xii. 32.) A peculiar term (*hagiographa*, or *sacred writings*) was applied to the books of *Job*, *Psalms*, and the compositions of *Solomon*; comprising inspired records, perhaps, even of greater antiquity than the writings of Moses. (Scott’s Introduction to Job.)

The fifth and sixth verses of the first chapter read connectedly, implicate a regular holy observance of every seventh portion of time, beginning early on either the *seventh* or *eighth* day; *probably*, on the latter, as the number of Job’s sons, and of their daily meetings, was

seven. (N.B. 13 ; ii. 1.) It will be said, if they had been *ten*, this meeting would have been on the tenth day. But this is assertion, without any ground ; whereas, the probability stated rests on two *facts*, viz., their *number*, which men may deem fortuitous ; and an *act* of worship, with which observance of a sabbath is in agreement. *It does not* appear to me probable that “the sons of God” can mean anything but what is meant in the sixth chapter of Genesis (verse 2) by the same expressions.

Bishop Tomline considers “the beginnings of the four books following Genesis as *very abrupt*.” Be this as it may, it does not affect this inquiry. Nay, may it not characterize a *separate*, rather than a *continuous* revelation, and contemporaneous writing of the books ? It is indeed the common characteristic of the books of the Old Testament as to one another. The book of *Exodus*, however, begins with reference to the history of Joseph, which occupies so large a portion of the book of Genesis. This is very natural, if Moses were the author of that *history*, consistent with his compilation of the other portions from earlier records, and with the general purpose of *qualifying* him for the work of which Exodus records an account. The events of 430 years of bondage are scarcely noticed in Genesis. Each of the other books is prefaced by a record indicating, generally, the time of its revelation. *Numbers*, indeed, states the day, month, and year ; and three of the five books mark the period of revelation as subsequent to the exode.

The exposure of Moses on the banks of the Nile, of which there is such a beautiful and touching narrative at the opening of Exodus, was an eminent act of faith. (Heb. xi. 23.) In what anxious exercise must this holy

principle have existed in the bosom of his relative as she "stood afar off" from the brink of the river, to watch "what would be done to him !" (Exod. ii. 3, 4.) How many misgiving thoughts and fears would agitate her bosom as she gazed ! Have the waters overwhelmed him ! Has the cold benumbed him ! Have the monsters of the river devoured him ! This act of faith stands out with the more prominence as in the mass of the Israelites the deepest ignorance prevailed. "And Moses said unto God, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, the God of your fathers hath sent me unto you, and they shall say unto me, What is His name ; what shall I say unto them ? (Exod. iii. 13.) This question could scarcely be proposed from his own ignorance. For full proof had been given of his faith in Christ, surely, by "refusing to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter."

And the Lord had, indeed, anticipated the question. (verses 6, 15.) It appears to relate rather to the nature of God, than simply to His Name ; and especially as both His Name and His answer imply this. Hence, the Lord repeats in the 15th verse what had been said before in the sixth. His education had been among idolaters ; "he was learned in all the wisdom of Egypt." It has been conjectured that Moses was an idolater when first called of God. Scott says, indeed, "Moses had not true faith and grace, before he visited his brethren." (Acts vii. 17, 22, 29.) But this hardly consists with what might be expected from the instruction of such parents ; nor with his early rejection of royal patronage on religious grounds ; even if this visit immediately followed his rejection of royal favour. (Heb. xi. 25, 26.) It must have been subsequent to this that the

Lord's purpose of delivering Israel was more minutely revealed to him, because his visit to them issued in immediate exile. (Exod. ii. 15.)

"He supposed his brethren would understand how that God by his hand would deliver them : but they understood not." (Acts vii. 25.) The divine communication appears to have been of a general nature, from the procedure of Moses (v. 23). His residence among idolaters, whose respect he enjoyed, counteracted, perhaps, the grace of God ; and fostered the natural hastiness, and arrogance apparent in this first essay. He mistook the time evidently, as well as perhaps the means of deliverance : for God's time was not arrived. "He that believeth shall not make haste," but a hasty temper, and a bad memory, for this faculty is not exempt from the common infirmities of human nature, are fearful incitements to unbelief, and presumption. This is evident, not here alone in the history of Moses, but at Horeb where his natural disposition broke out again fatally to himself and Aaron (Ps. lxxviii. 19, 20, 41, 42) ; and at Sin, where his doubt of God's power to feed the people with bread and flesh in the wilderness overpowered his recollection of all the Lord's wonderful doings. (Num. xi. 21, 22 ; xii. 3 ; Ps. lxxviii. 19 ; Num. xx. 10—12 ; Matt. xvi. 8, 11.) It is certain, then, that revelation had been made to Moses of Israel's approaching liberation ; of his appointment to be their leader ; and that he had been supernaturally endowed for an accomplishment of God's design, to some extent. (Exod. ii. 11, 15, 24 ; Acts vii. 22.) His first error seems to have been impatience, in not awaiting the Lord's time, specific instructions, and indispensable qualification for the work, in a certain knowledge of his own nation, the history of the Church

in past ages ; and especially in its original foundation in the natural covenant of God with men. This last point was, evidently, of paramount importance, as the basis of all the institutions about to be established under the divine instructions. In every case the Lord qualifies His servants for the work which He directs them to perform. The prompt procedure of Moses on his first visit harmonizes with the general nature of the revelation, and a belief that the vengeance executed on the Egyptian was his own voluntary act. If banishment followed his rejection of royal patronage, not an unlikely proceeding for an arbitrary and sanguinary king, it might have influenced him in this anticipation of the work of deliverance.

The discipline of forty years in exile, experience in the ways, and full instruction in the truth of God, appear to have been absolutely requisite for his great undertaking :—and account for the instantaneous, and unhesitating promptitude of Moses throughout the narrative of Israel's deliverance, and his establishment of the Mosaic law, and church administration. And God Himself bears testimony to the blessed result, in strong contrast to his premature embarkation in the work, and his hasty procedure in it, saying, "the man Moses was very meek above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." (Num. xii. 3.)

The disorders which had crept into the social frame, infecting even good men, and much more the mass, appear to have rendered it needful for a reformer to repair to the original constitutions of nature. (Gen. vi. 1—3.) And, indeed, the prevalent violations of natural, or moral law seem to have led to the written record of human duty. (Matt. xix. 3—12.)

For "the law was added because of transgressions." (Gal. iii. 18, 19.) This could not be the law of sacrifice, for it both existed, and had been observed except in the marked transgression of Cain. Nor was it the ceremonial law, as this existed in a few leading provisions. But it was the law of Moses, added because of transgressions of a previously existing law : which could only be that of the Covenant of nature, or the moral law.

The general *design* of the Book of Genesis appears to be precisely that which would qualify Moses for the honourable and serious undertaking of reforming and establishing the Church of God among the descendants of Abraham.

The history of Creation, of the first covenant with man, of which, perhaps, there is a significant intimation in God's dealings with Noah ; (Gen. vii. viii.) of the worship of God ; of the introduction of sin ; of man's temporal and spiritual duties ; his original nature, dignity, power, and intelligence ; the promise of redemption through a second covenant, are comprised in about three chapters. This is abundant, whether copied by Moses or revealed to him, although written by Adam, as a guide to that eminent man in an establishment of the Church on the principles of original truth, preparatory to its final and glorious institution under the New Covenant Head.

The record of the Church in its earliest ages, and second state then passing away, to the time of the Deluge, including a genealogical chapter ; are contained in about two chapters.

The revelations of ante-diluvian apostacy ; the character of God's children, with the unhappy result of promiscuous marriages with the unregenerate ; of the final withdrawal of His Spirit, interspersed with

traces of the law regulative of sacrifices and worship ; of the post-diluvian covenant with all flesh ; the confusion of tongues ; the dispersion of men to overspread the whole earth ; the original descent of God's people from Shem ; of the call of the Gentiles, descendants of Japheth, notwithstanding the mercy about to be shown to the posterity of Shem ; with genealogical tables occupying about two chapters, are all compressed into little more than six chapters. (Gen. xxii. v ; ix. 27.) The remaining portion, or nearly four-fifths of the whole Book, relates to the early history of the people whom Moses was about to conduct out of Egypt. The condensed form of this pre-requisite instruction, is in exact keeping with this view ; ten chapters comprising the leading events relative to the Church for 2500 years !

It appears to have been one great design of God in the separation of that people to Himself, to preserve His truth unadulterated in the world. (See Hodges on Job.) Twice before, it had been opened to universal man, and universal apostacy and corruption had been the result.

As the Lord, then, was about to institute His Church anew, it does appear most rational to expect that He would communicate to His servant an account of that Church in time past ; and an indubitable history of the people among whom He was peculiarly to dwell, as well as of the fundamental principles of natural or social relations ; the contemplated basis of the Mosaic Institutions. And this was evidently *necessary*, inasmuch as it was actually provided.

In the period between the first visit of Moses to the Israelites, and his mission with final instructions from

God, under a positive assurance of ultimate success, an interval of forty years elapsed, and we are informed that Moses did receive revelations from heaven in this period. "O, my Lord," said Moses, "I am not eloquent, *neither heretofore, nor since Thou hast spoken to Thy servant* : but I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue." (Exod. iv. 10.)

There is here very evident reference to his failure forty years before ; an erroneous impression as to its cause ; and the statement of a fact ; *viz.*, that God, in the period intervening, had favoured him with revelations. So disheartened had he been at the result of his former effort, that he still adhered to the supposed hopelessness of the case with most tenacious unbelief ; even after a removal of his objections arising in the popular ignorance and corruption. "But behold, they will not believe me, nor hearken to my voice ; for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared to thee." (Exod. ii. 14.) The issue of that attempt in exile and sorrow was so vivid in his recollection still, that he could not avail himself at once of an experience of forty years ; nor perceive that the Lord had neither abandoned His purpose, nor changed the leading means of accomplishing His design. Miraculous powers were therefore bestowed. Further instruction and preparation ensued in Midian. And the barrier even of a slow speech was removed by substitution of his eloquent brother, as spokesman to the people. (Exod. iv 2—18). Thus qualified in every way, his reluctance vanished. His deliberation now stands out in conspicuous contrast to his temerity before ; and God graciously removed all remaining apprehension of the vindictive Egyptians, from the consequences of whose anger he had fled away.

This view renders the language of Moses at Sin as to the sabbath natural, as implicating a previous knowledge of its institution and design. Looking at its prescription as part of the narrative of the Creation, the popular knowledge of it as vague and confused from disuse and the corruptions of idolatrous worship in Egypt, yet, inevitably maintained by the Providential introduction of the very term (S B T) for *week* into their language ; both the language of Moses, and the actions of the people, are *precisely* what one might expect. But this will be more clearly seen in the next chapter. God's directions to commit the other books to the permanent form of writing, in order to their safe custody near the ark, are very precise, and harmonise with the fact of a previous revelation and compilation, if not the writing, of this remarkable book.

CHAPTER IV.

A CONSIDERATION OF THE TRANSACTIONS AT MARAH AND SIN.

THREE days after leaving the Red Sea the Israelites were afflicted with thirst at Marah, and "The waters were bitter. And the people murmured against Moses, saying, What shall we drink? And he cried unto the Lord; and the Lord shewed him a tree, which, when he had cast into the waters, the waters were made sweet. *There He made for them a statute and an ordinance, and there He proved them,* and said, If thou wilt diligently hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in His sight, and wilt give ear to His commandments, and keep all His statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee which I have brought on the Egyptians, for I am the Lord that healeth thee." (Exod. xv. 22—25.)

Sin was a place eastward of the Red Sea. The passage relative to Marah is an *anticipation* of the transactions at Sin, which are narrated in the next chapter, as these were of the covenant about to be formally ratified

at Sinai, in the renewal of God's promised mercy and favour to Abraham and his seed after the flesh. For those expressions, "the Lord thy God," "His commandments, and *all* His statutes," comprise plainly the body of moral, ceremonial, and judicial institutions of Moses in the Sinaitic church, or *the law*. *Precepta*, "precepts," principally negative and prohibitory laws; *Statuta*, "statutes," usually the rules, decrees, and ordinances of worship; and *Legés*, "laws,"—the whole body of positive laws, or the revealed will of God, as to the government and discipline of His church, and to direct the conduct of each individual believer. (See Hodges on Job, Prel. Disc. p. 5.) As the Sabbath entered into that original law independent of the prescription in the Decalogue, so it would appear that this *rest*, expressive of God's satisfaction, which is necessarily implied in His covenant with Israel, is the basis of all His dealings with the church; it is the bond of the covenant of peace between God and man.

Some among the Jews have, in very distant times, contended that the Sabbath originated at Marah and Sin. (Owen, vol. ii. p. 294. 298.) But this was held by a comparatively insignificant portion of that nation. This paternity is not a recommendation of the notion. St. Augustine held that the *common* opinion referred its institution to the creation.

Poole and others have thought that no special ordinance is intended here; but a renewal, generally, of the covenant condition with Abraham, "Walk before Me, and be thou perfect" (Gen. xvii. 1), as they were now actually on their way to the promised land. Although two facts appear to be stated in the 15th chapter of Exodus (verse 25), yet we do not find a record of any

statute and ordinance among the transactions at Marah. Moreover, "the statute, and ordinance to prove them," appears to distinguish some one prescription eminent above all, comprised in the more extended description of "that which is right in His sight, His commandments, and all His statutes." *This* seems to deserve special observation ; and if anticipatory, as I doubt not, of the record as to the Sabbath in the following chapter, it is in strict accordance.

It appears evident that the word *there* (xv. 25), is reflective of *Marah* (ver. 23), as this is of "the wilderness of Shur." (Ver. 22.) So that the place intended may be, not Marah, but this "wilderness of Shur." (Numb. xxxiii. 8—12.) And thus it is anticipatory of what is narrated in the 16th chapter. (Ver. 4, 5, 6.) On the delivery of the Decalogue it is observably repeated, as if retrospective, "God is come to prove you," *i. e.* as He had declared before at Marah. (Exod. xx. 20.) This determines the *proof* to be existent in the sabbatical prescription revived at Sin. In His testimony to the conscientious obedience of Abraham the Lord declares, "He obeyed my voice, and kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes, and My laws." (Gen. xxvi. 5.) The passage in Exodus is almost a literal repetition of this, which shows a minute acquaintance with his duties. And, in the 2nd Book of Chronicles, the same expression is employed relatively to the worship of God, "We keep the charge of the Lord our God." (xiii. 11.)

The next chapter (Exod. xvi.) contains a narrative of events subsequent a few days only to the transactions at Marah. In this there is an undeniable observance of the sabbath. In the fourth verse of the chapter the *proof* of Israel is expressly attached to *the general law*

regulating the gathering of manna, and inclusive, therefore, of the *sixth day law*. Now, reference to this general law in which there is not any discernible *test* of their faith, except in that part which related to the sixth day, clearly shows this part of it to be the leading provision of the law, and suspends the significance of this law for the miraculous support of their bodies, on that prescription which related to the soul. (Exod. xv. 25.) It authenticates, as an anticipation also, the statement about Marah.

And let this be considered in connection with the declaration of Jesus, that "He was the bread of life." If *one* part of this type were fulfilled under the gospel, we must look there for a fulfilment of the *other*. The supply is to be expected both "day by day," and in double measure on one of the seven. Here a law was actually given for the supply of their daily food. This law is first stated in *general* terms, and then so framed as to secure an observance of the seventh day, by a double miracle recurring weekly on the sixth day. "Behold ! I will rain bread from heaven for you, and the people shall go out, and gather *a certain rate every day*" ("the portion of a day in his day," *marg.*) This *general* law is, evidently, so expressed as to include that part which related to the sanctification of a sabbath ; the *portion* of the sixth day being *double* that of any other day, as subsequently particularised by Moses. And then follows a statement of the *special object* of the statute, "*that I may prove them, whether they will walk in My law or no.*" If the Lord were careful for their temporal sustenance, much more was He mindful of the interests of their souls. Nor, as it is intimated, was there any probability of *universal* obedience, where the leading provision

for the stability of the church, in its natural and spiritual relations, was disregarded. And this is, indeed, the common testimony of experience. Transgression of the sabbath is never a solitary sin. If a special duty to God be disregarded, how can we rationally expect regard to those duties which are of minor importance, or which relate primarily to man. If it be an infallible rule that "he who is unjust in that which is least will be unjust also in much," still more certain is it that contempt of the *greater* duties will entail a violation of those which are *less*. Lax opinions about the sacred obligations of a sabbath are too commonly accompanied by coldness and formality, not seldom matured into scepticism on all religious subjects. (Bp. Wilson's Sermon, v. p. 124, "To rise up," &c.) The pervading influence of obedience to this duty on *all* moral obligations appears decidedly to prove the necessity of a sabbath for all men, to secure the same end.

This important point, then, being secured, the special and leading clause follows in separate form, to mark its importance. "And it shall come to pass that on the *sixth day* they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be *twice as much as they gather daily*." (Ver. 5.) From the general terms in which this is couched, the object of the law not being specified ; from a special *test* being attached to the *general* law, as *proof of the people* ; and from the connection which is implied between their obedience to this, and their reverence of the *whole* law of God, it may be inferred that but faint knowledge of sabbatical law had survived centuries of disuse, bondage, and idolatrous corruptions. Its obscurity in the public mind explains the resort to Moses at the moment of gathering on the sixth day, for explanation

of its special import. Its object was evidently well known to him. The *proof* of Israel was, as evidently, not in an observance of the "certain rate every day;" nor is their disobedience of this portion of the law marked beyond an expression of vehement displeasure. "Moses was wroth with them." (xvi. 20.) Obedience to *this*, on five days weekly, was secured by their daily necessities on the one hand, and the superfluous trouble of disobedience on the other. For "he that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little"—being sure to gather the prescribed omer—"had no lack" (Ver. 18.) It would appear, therefore, that *renewal* of this ordinance was contemplated from the moment of their liberation; and that the Lord marked the precedence of the sabbath in the whole law, by anticipation of all the peculiarity of its inscription on "the tables of the covenant." And, as Bishop Wilson has observed, "it lifts its head" above all the ceremonial and judicial laws of Moses." (Exod. vi. 1; x. 9, 25, 26; xiii. 3, &c.; xv. 17; xviii. 16, 20.) It may be added that it stands in the moral law on the very next step to those which lead the worshipper to the seat and throne of Jehovah.

There is a quotation in the Christian Penny Record for October 27, 1847, from the Rev. A. Thompson, p. 3. He says there, "in the first place the people gathered of their own accord twice as much bread, two omers for one man, on the sixth day." I feel diffidence in differing from such men, as in the case of Scott; and should, readily and thankfully, acknowledge the correction of my error, if I be wrong. But, how can this be considered as "their voluntary act," looking at the language of the sixteenth chapter, in the very outset of the narrative of Moses? (4, 5, 22.) It appears that the general law, in

its two leading provisions, was revealed to Moses on the very first complaint, and murmuring of the people : and that he must have promulgated it to the people. For, otherwise, how could they know the duty of a double gathering on the sixth day, or forget their recent experience of the corruption that awaited what was left until the seventh. Nor does it appear likely under ignorance of that law, that there would have been such unity of action on the sixth day? If the law of the sixth day were observed, then the daily law was, necessarily known. But why would the divine prescription be revealed to them as to the daily, and less important part alone of their duty? And how could their knowledge of the duty, and its relation to the Sabbath, be reconciled to the ignorance of their Rulers? It appears most natural to believe that the object of the Rulers was to ascertain the nature, and not the existence, of the law as to the sixth day ; and it would be consistent with the obscurity, which evidently prevailed as to an original institution of the Sabbath. They knew the law, but not its precise meaning, and this therefore, Moses proceeded instantly to explain.— (verse 23.)

In utter ignorance of a Sabbath I do not see how the “holy convocation” days of the feast of unleavened bread, could be intelligible to them, deriving their nature from the Sabbath : nor, indeed, the explanation of the Jewish law-giver at Sin. Were they ignorant of the law as to the sixth day, then, they must have been conscious transgressors of the daily law, whilst intent on observance of the sabbatical ordinance, which does not appear likely ; and is opposed to the conclusion implied in the test of their obedience to sabbatical law, relatively to all the other laws of God.

The proof, then, as to the general law must have had regard to the double gathering on the sixth day, to secure the sabbatical rest. It looks clearly beyond delivery of the law as to the sixth day, which is positively asserted to be founded on the importance of a pre-existent sabbatical institution : “*therefore*, He giveth you on the sixth day, the bread of two days!” (Exod. xvi. 27, 29.)

Moses, then, had not waited until the Rulers’ report of the peoples’ acts on the sixth day, to deliver God’s command as it is recorded in the fifth verse ; (xvi. 5.) and which is not named in the sixteenth verse, where the daily law alone is recited. This their conduct proves. (verse 22.) So that the difference between the fourth verse and the sixteenth is this ; the one expresses the general law, by a certain rate every day : the other defines this certain rate on the five days. The same form is observable in the fourth commandment. First, the universal and unchangeable duty is asserted, *viz.*, that the Sabbath must be observed. Its special relation to Israel and their special duties in it, is then detailed. And in conclusion, the formal reason of this universal law is stated to be precisely what it was at the beginning.

The supply of manna does not appear to have been precisely sufficient for a days gathering, and no more. For, in the very first instance many exceeded the prescribed omer. Nor are we to suppose there was only this precise measure on the sixth day. The general indisposition to this rest, if known, rather than a readiness to voluntary reverence of the day, is plain from their disobedience when Moses had even recited and explained the law, in its relation to the seventh day. It is very evident that much ignorance, and more profaneness

characterized the state of Israel as to the Sabbath. This is not surprising. They must have sacrificed, in its observance, “an abomination to the Egyptians.” Nor, is it to be supposed that unprincipled and rapacious masters would remit a seventh part of the labour of their slaves. Centuries of disuse, and ascertained infection by idolatry, would inevitably obliterate all regard to, and almost all knowledge of the day of rest ; except, perhaps, in really godly persons : (Exod. xvii. 15. Scott’s Commentary.) to whom this almost universal ignorance and indifference, might secure facilities of observing the day of rest. Let it be observed how Moses expressed himself to the Rulers. (Exod. xvi. 23, 26.) “*This is that which the Lord hath said, “to-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath of the Lord.”*” (Lev. viii. 5 ; x. 3.)

Now, *when* had the Lord said this, but by implication in the sixth day law for gathering manna to prove them, and which they did not understand ; and if then, by an undeniable reference of these provisions at Sin, to the law originally delivered at the creation ? This seems the only explanation consistent with all the facts, and the language of Moses to the rulers. He does not say, as he would have done if it had been a revelation made to him at that moment, “this is that which the Lord saith.” But he speaks so as to recognize the prescription at Sin relatively to the sabbath, and its pre-existence besides. “See, for that the Lord *hath given* to you the Sabbath, *therefore He giveth you* on the sixth day the bread of two days.” This is, in repetition of the 23rd verse, even more remarkable in its expression, “He *hath given* the sabbath as an ordinance obligatory in all time past and at present ; and *He giveth* now the

law, as to the sixth days' bread, to ensure its observance. When actual transgression of this holy rest, therefore, took place, the Lord himself remonstrated, saying to Moses, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments, and my laws?" Does not this imply the previous delivery of a *commandment* as to the Sabbath? And an enrolment of the sabbath among the other commandments of the Lord?

Can words, on the whole, be more explicit? This is a recognition, therefore, of *an original* ordinance and law; not to insist on an implication of it in the feast of unleavened bread, at the moment of approaching deliverance from bondage, at the instant of providing for their temporal support, and to shew that the care of our heavenly Father for *the body* stands in inseparable intimacy with His regard to the soul, and His own glory in the worship of His church as at the beginning. (John vi.) The whole narrative is thus harmonized, showing an unchangeable demand by God of obedience to this primeval institution. A subsequent and more precise delivery of this law in the Decalogue, with undoubted reference to its pre-existence even there, is no more disproof of a previous obligation than the plainly-asserted duty here is disproof of an original prescription at the creation.

Let any man compare the narrative of facts in Genesis connected with the sabbath; the retrospective terms of the fourth commandment, where repetition was intended to mark an adaptation of the leading provision of this law of nature to the new church state of Moses, with the narratives at Marah and Sin, both which places were comprised in the wilderness of Shur, as this was in

Etham ; and an implication of pre-existent prescription in this case is as plain as a present prescription in the other.

There are two *essential* characteristics evident in sabbatical institution. First, the act of God's rest, or satisfaction in His *finished* work. Second, *the time* of this act following *immediately* the perfected operation of Jehovah.

Both these points are undeniably plain in the fourth commandment. But there was not at Sin any such *work* nor any such *act* of God ; and yet the sabbath was observed ! And this observance was, therefore, on some anterior ground of obligation. If the building of the house of Moses commenced at the liberation of Israel from bondage, this was only *the beginning*, not its *perfection*.

The sabbath was enjoined at Sinai, as it had been previously at Sin. But *there* they were only at *the* beginning of Moses' house. The work perfected, and laid there as the basis of the sabbath, was expressly referred to the *creation* ! And *the time* of this act of God was on the seventh day, or the sabbath, at the beginning.

Now both of these characteristic features stand out with peculiar prominence in *the Lord's day* of the gospel church. At the very *instant* of completing the "marvellous work" of redemption was the glorious entrance of its Author into His rest ! These are principles too palpably marked by God Himself to be denied.

The opinion, therefore, which would originate the sabbath at Sinai is at open war with the very elements

of sabbatical institution, propounded by the mouth of God Himself!

Special pleading may be tried, and has been tried ; but it is as the spider's web, which only entraps flies. It cannot be converted to any practical purpose, as a covering to error.

N.B. Is. lix. 5, 6, 7.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE MORALITY OF THE SABBATH, AND ON THE PRESCRIPTION IN THE DECALOGUE.

A LAW is *divine* which has been either expressly revealed, or the properties of which are divine. (See Taylor on Titus.) Thus, the divine origin of *truth* is inferred from its antiquity, holiness, perfection, effects on the receiver, and the purity and excellence of the means necessary to its propagation, as well as from its inspiration. If the origin of a law can be traced, therefore, to the nature of God, it must be divine, as well as when divinely prescribed.

It is common enough to hear and use the phrases *moral*; *moral certainty*; *moral impossibility*; and *moral obligation*. But it is not so easy to define their precise meaning, as commonly employed, nor to ascertain with certainty their derivation. Let the reader pause for a moment, and make the experiment, until he can arrive at some plain and definite conclusion. The examples in Johnson's Dictionary (Quarto Ed. 1785) illustrative of the

term are anything but satisfactory ; and especially the quotation from South's Sermons. The general observation of Hooker appears especially true as to this term, "many talk of the truth which have never sounded the depth from which it springeth." (Eecl. Pol.)

"*Ut enim morale ex fonte legis naturæ proficiscitur, ita ad omnes spectat homines, omni loco et tempore, nisi speciale Dei mandatum, quod in quibusdam tamen tantum fit, accedat, quo præceptum generale exceptionem patitur.*" Hackspanii Manuale, p. 473.

"For, as that which is moral proceeds from the fountain of natural law, so doth it look on all men in every place and time, unless the special command of God intervene, which yet can happen only in certain cases, by which the general precept suffers exception."

The Latin expression suggests an idea of the *form* or *manner* of an action or rule, but the Greek term *εθος*, as rendered and used to signify "*lex non scripta*," or. *unwritten law*, would intimate rather *the nature* or *principle* of things in which it originates. The *common law* of our land as *unwritten* and distinguished from the written or statute law, is founded in the common sense of men, or on what have been the commonly-received dictates of natural truth, confirmed by the experience of men.

An idea of *certainty* appears inseparable from law. Otherwise that which is a *rule* or *right*, might be both straight and crooked at the same time. To *unwritten law* is attached generally an idea of *nearness*, if not of *proximity* to the source.

This expression might originate probably in the fact that traditionary law must be generally the earliest species of law among men. It does not, indeed, follow

that *purity* is an inseparable characteristic of tradition. The stream may recede from purity as it becomes more remote from the source.

Now, as law originates in natural truth, and is in its essence precedent to the form assumed in operation, and the permanence of its letter by writing, so *the reason* of doing anything is more nearly allied to the source of an action, or custom, or rule, than its *mere form*.

Thus, "thou shalt not steal," arises in the natural truth of God's absolute sovereignty over all things, and man's possession of all things in dependence on God. But the prohibited *form* is the putting of our hand to the property of another, or ourselves into God's place and our brother's as lords paramount over them both.

Thus men have attached a kind of sacredness to the number seven, giving practical form to the sentiment in various ways. But *the reason* of this opinion is more remote than *the fact*, or the *εθος*, or any of the forms assumed by the notion.

In the New Testament this term *ethos* is applied sometimes to the body of Mosaic institutions, at others to some special portion of them, and once to a custom proscribed as sinful and evil in its original principle. (Heb. x. 25.)

We know that certain principles of natural truth commend themselves to man's reason, and are prescriptive to him of duty to this extent. (Matt. xix. 3—12; 1 Cor. xi. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 12—14.) For both our Lord and His apostles appeal to their existence and imperative claims.

Whatever, then, may be traced to the *law of nature*, or to the nature of God as visible in His works, must be of a moral or divine obligation. Nor can these

principles of moral duty, so far as thus derived, be dispensed with innocently but by the authority of God Himself. The Author of natural law alone can have the right to disannul or prescribe, and to resume or confer either property or life.

It would seem, then, that the term originated in the necessity that *principles* of truth, in which moral or divine prescriptions arise should be *embodied* in a practical form, as the *manner* in which they are to be expressed. So that *morality* is, in fact, what St. Paul denominates "the form of knowledge and of the truth," when meaning "*the law*," involving both principles and practice. And hence our Lord resolves the whole of moral duty, as comprised in the Decalogue, into the one principle of love to God and man, or, into that principle of goodness which constitutes the divine essence, "for God is love." And natural truth being primary to all truth and certain when known, the term *moral* as arising in it, has passed into popular usage to designate that which is *elementary, strong, certain* to the mind of man.

The alledged distinction between a *moral* and *positive* command is this: "what is *moral* is commanded because it is *right*, and what is *positive* is right because it is *commanded*. (Mod. Sabb. Exam.) But *all* God's commands must have, from truth inherent in them, a divine property and moral essence. And hence it appears equally true of a *positive* prescription, as it is of a moral law, that it is, and must be "commanded because it is *right*." Obedience to the one involves God's glory even its *mystery*, as well as the other in its *perspicuity* to the reason of man. For "it is the glory of God to conceal a matter."

The *intrinsic* nature of moral commands does not

altogether depend upon our perception, but our perception upon their nature. If of a *moral* nature we perceive it, but if they be of a *positive* nature we see it darkly, or perhaps not at all. Our perception is not a *consequence* but a *cause* of the power with which they address the reasonable soul. Scott the commentator observes in his preface (p. 21,) “ Various controversies have arisen about natural religion, which many suppose to be rather taken for granted than made known by revelation. But the term is ambiguous ; for the word *natural* includes the *propensities of our hearts*, as well as the *powers of our understandings*; and the same truths which accord to the latter are often totally opposite to the former.”

The moral command addresses both our reason and our faith. We see that it is reasonable, and cannot but believe it to be *right*. The *positive command* speaks directly to our faith, and indirectly to our reason. We do not perceive the ground of the prescription, but, as arising in the will of God, we *believe*, as Abraham did in not withholding his only son, we believe it to be right. Thus it is in regard to the Sabbath. It is right to every reasonable mind that God should be worshipped or “*honoured and feared*” as the Creator and Ruler of all. It is a natural and moral duty.

And it is also *right*, because it is the Lord's will, that *one-seventh part* of all time should be devoted to His worship ; but why this proportion of life should have been decreed for the purpose is a mystery impenetrable by the mind of man—a purely *positive* precept. Beyond the acknowledged right of God to prescribe this, and our utter incapacity to define, without His revelation, *the time* which would be proper for this duty, we are

more in the dark than even Abraham was when commanded to offer up his son. One part, *i. e.* the worship, is the *essence*; the other, so far as we know, is an *accident* of the command.

The same mysterious principle of perfection entered in some sense into the covenant of nature, as already seen. If this division of time had a leading view to the sabbath and worship of God in the church, the prophet's declaration is intelligible and plain.

The Decalogue is denominated by St. Paul, "the tables of the covenant;" of which he says, it "had ordinances of worship," or of "divine service," as the term means. (Heb. ix. 1, 4.) Now, as this peculiar covenant was an adaptation of the covenant of nature—comprised *the whole* Decalogue—and the sabbath as their instituted covenant sign of relations in the worship and service of God, what are we to conclude? That it was an empty token? No, but, rather, an efficacious *means* as plainly affirmed by Moses. (Exo. xxxi. 13—15.) The principle, carried out in this manner, by which God's worship was ruled. (Col. ii. 17.)

The apostle declares, generally, that we have, under the gospel dispensation, "the body" of which they possessed the *shadow*; and in this he includes the sabbath. And as the Law was *predictive* of this body of evangelical truth, so was it necessarily *reflective* of all essential truth in the law of nature. The gospel comprises the "old and new commandment, which was from the beginning." (Deut. vi. 5.) This is the commandment of love, as our Lord expressly declares. (Matt. xxii. 35—40; 1 John ii. 7—10; Gal. iii. 16.) It embraces, undeniably, the whole Decalogue; and, therefore, necessarily comprises the principle of the fourth

commandment, or of a sabbath.* I do not see how this conclusion is to be parried. For, it is "the old commandment," as inalienable in its object *from the beginning*. And it "is true in Him," as emanating from His nature, who "is a Spirit," and seeketh "those to worship Him who shall worship Him in spirit and in truth;" who shall "serve Him in truth, and with all their heart." (1 Sam. xii. 24, 25.) This commandment is *old*, generally, as despoiled of its pristine vigour by sin, just as the "law is weak through the flesh." And it is "new," as an engrafted word in the gospel; of which it had the form and shadow in the law. And thus "it is true" both "in Him," in whom it arose, and "in us," to whom it has descended, and has become effectual, as "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus." And hence the whole Decalogue, and the sabbath as part of it, necessarily entered into the Mosaic covenant. And it is both "old and new;" for it is implied that it could not otherwise have been *true*, since the truth, like God, never changes. It existed before, and it survives, the Law of Moses. There is not any possibility of escaping this conclusion. It is alike true that the natural covenant was adapted as a *whole* to the Mosaic church, and that the sabbath, as part of the Decalogue, entered into the covenant of the Mosaic church, as it had formed part of the covenant of nature.

In another place it is said, "He declared unto you His covenant, which He commanded you to perform, even *ten* commandments; and He wrote them upon two tables of stone." (Deut. iv. 13.) Observance of the sabbath was a part of its conditions. But it is said in the next chapter, "The Lord made a covenant with

* Not of a vague indeterminate worship, but worship in its original principle and rule.

us in Horeb ; the Lord *made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us*, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." (v. 2, 3.) Now there must be some sense in which each of these assertions is true ; and this as to first institution. "He made it not with the fathers." (Gal. iii. 16—19.) Why ? Because the covenant made with the fathers, *i. e.* with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was the *covenant of grace*, the covenant of "*promise.*" (1 Chron. xvi. 15—17.) And, likewise, because that was, substantially, the *old covenant of nature* made with *Adam* ; made with all men in him ; and "not alone with the fathers." But He made *this* covenant "with *their children*" in an adaptation of the covenant of works, or the law of nature, to His administration of the church under the Sinaitic law. (Deut. xxix. 1.)

If this covenant, then, "made with them," as comprehensive of the Decalogue included the sabbath, and held forth the sabbath as indicative of its entire significance, and if it were identified in all its leading principles with that "*not made with the fathers,*" but with all men, and one, therefore, in principle as *old and new*, then *this* must have comprised a holy rest.

It is observable, too, that "whilst no other commandment is so fully explained, it is the only one which, on religious considerations, has become the special object of doubt and dispute, and openly repudiated as of moral and divine obligation. And this opposition, however marked by talent, has been characterized by contemptuous scorn of adverse views, as *innovations* on the primitive sentiments of the church, and of the growth of only 200 years !

"Athanasius says, The Lord transferred the Sabbath to the Lord's Day. (A.D. 326.)

"Leo thus expresses the sentiments of the whole

Church (A.D. 469), ‘We ordain, according to the true meaning of the Holy Ghost, and of the Apostles thereby directed, that on the sacred day wherein our own integrity was restored, all do rest and cease from labour. For, if the Jews did so much reverence their sabbaths, which were but a shadow of ours, are not we which inhabit the light and truth of grace, bound to honour that day which the Lord himself hath honoured, and hath therein delivered from death and dishonour?’” (Bishop of Calcutta, Sermon IV. p. 111.)

In the Churchman’s Monthly Penny Magazine for November, 1850, p. 495, there are important facts stated as to an early and *very strict* observance of the Lord’s day in Saxon times; and which can hardly be explained but by the general belief in its moral and Divine obligation.

See Willett Syn. Pap. p. 500, for authorities to show that observance of the Lord’s day does not rest on Apostolical Tradition, but on the Bible, in opposition to the Douay translators, page 300.

“The ceremonial law was neither spoken by God Himself to the whole people, nor written by the finger of the Lord. But the Decalogue was written by Jehovah not once but twice; and, doubtless with some peculiar and emphatic meaning. This is at least a distinction in providence, if not of authority and sanction.” (Hooker Ecel. Pol., Vol. I., p. 178.) I would add, of pre-eminence in order, pointing significantly to the first and leading duty of man towards his brother, and arising infallibly in the right discharge of his duty to God. Nay, may not this second writing be a typical and significant act, predictive of permanence on an abolition of the Mosaic dispensation, as it is

reflective of primitive obliteration by sin, and a continuance of obligation.

The legal rigour attached to the plain recital of an original prescription of the sabbath, presents an additional argument for its pre-existence. (P. 231.)

For the fourth Commandment is not, as Burnside says, “merely a *repetition* of the institution.” It is this, and something more. Repetitions in Scripture have been alluded to before. An *additional feature*, as here, and as in the rite of circumcision, when attached to the covenant of Inheritance in the land of promise ; or, the reasons already named, are the ground of such repetitions in Scripture. And this would be no trivial objection to the argument of *prolepsis*, as it would minister occasion to suspicion and perversion, which have, therefore, occurred as to this Commandment alone. (Lev. xvi. 34 ; Ezek. xxxvii. 25.)

It may be observed that the perpetuity of the Covenant of Inheritance, inferred from the expression, “*everlasting*,” “*an everlasting inheritance*” is not affected by a subsequent restricted application of the word to the Jewish dispensation which was of temporary institution. The *promise* of inalienable right in the soil was long before that dispensation ; and not repeated by Moses. (1 Chron. xvi. 17, 18.) See Jehoshaphat’s prayer, (2 Chron. xx. 7,) “gavest it to the seed of Abraham, Thy friend, *for ever*.”

The Jewish sabbath was typical and ceremonial, as well as *moral* to the Jews ; and in this last sense it is still observed by the church. “It was a sign between them and the Lord, to distinguish them from other people ; and so the right keeping of the Lord’s day is a notable outward mark of difference between the Church of God

and all others. On the sabbath they resorted together to hear the law read and preached. And for this cause, viz., the exercise of religion, are Christians chiefly bound to the Sabbath." (Willett Synops. Pap. p. 500.)

The fourth Commandment evidently recognizes, reverts to, and modifies man's original dominion, disturbed by sin, and the bond by which the social and religious relations of God and man were secured. It is the *golden link* which unites God in fellowship with man, and man with his brother. The restrictive provisions pervading the body of the prescription, evidently imply a state of original freedom as the basis of this adapted statute. Man's rule over the woman; subordination of the parts of society; disposition to an abuse of power over man and beast, and even temporal duties to his own harm, are all adverse to the fact of man's perfection, and entered evidently by sin. The great law which restrained the Jew, then, from profaneness, idolatry, scepticism, infidelity, and oppression, effected this not because he was the child of Abraham, but because he was of the fallen seed of a sinner; and it is, therefore, of universal application. The simple and original law introduces, therefore, and closes the Commandment; to show that its original necessity and nature remain unchanged. But, the minuteness of its ceremonial enactments in the body of the statute, and which extend to all the relations of man without exception, indicates how much more that original law has become needful to the preparation of man, by a prescribed and holy intercourse with our heavenly Father and His children here, for "the general Assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven."

Ceremonial adjuncts to an original duty are too plain in the fourth Commandment, then, to be reasonably denied. And as ceremonies are truth enveloped in shadows, so these are characteristic of the Mosaic, and not of the natural covenant (Col. ii. 17 ; Heb. viii. 5 ; x. 1.) : and in their minuteness retentive of the general principle, or the perfection of “the law.”

There cannot be any rational doubt, surely, that “the *seventh day*” was prescribed to Israel ; and that an observance of any other day by them would have been a violation of the duty. As there would not, otherwise, be anything in the commandment to sanctify the seventh day peculiar to Israel, had the *original* duty been restricted to the same day precisely ; it must be inferred that the *principle* was involved in the sanctification of a seventh portion of time. This is the more plain from the fact that the sabbath, in its origin, was instituted not for one nation, but for universal man. It could not be maintained, therefore, literally, but on the principle of consecrating as holy each recurring seventh day. If two vessels sailed from a given port, one to the East, and another to the West, to circumnavigate the earth, one would gain, and the other lose a day at the year’s end, as every person knows : so that relatively to one another, and those from whom they set out, the Sabbath would be observed on three different days of the week !

It may be difficult for us, possibly, to separate an idea of *Saturday* from “the seventh day,” as we read the Commandment. But if this be considered with attention, it is not a necessary conclusion from the words of Jehovah, that “the sabbath day” of the eighth verse was anything more than *a* seventh day,

following six days of labour. This relates primarily to the original prescription. Supposing the precise "seventh day" observed by Israel at Sin, and which might be or not the very day observed by Adam, to have been maintained until Joshua's time, yet, a disturbance of this precision must have necessarily arisen in the quiescence of the sun, moon, and earth. If this protracted the light for twelve hours, *e.g.*, of the night on the third day, that which would have been, but for this miracle, the *fourth day*, would remain still the *third day*. And hence, the next sabbath would be kept on the *sixth*, and not on the *seventh day*. Were this maintained invariably to the day of the resurrection, then, our first day would indeed correspond with the day sanctified at Sin. This is at least plain, that a *precise* day is not the material point in the prescription. It is not to be forgotten, also, that something of the same kind must have occurred from a retrocession of the sun-dial of Ahaz, under Hezekiah.

If the covenant of Israel were in any sense peculiar to that people, as we shall prove at the right time ; and, if the seventh day were hallowed to them in their peculiar relation to God, as it was, being their covenant sign : then it follows that the seventh day was, as such, *accidentally* of the original sabbath. And hence, it ceases with the peculiar occasion as the seventh day ; and remains in its original principle as a seventh part of all time. Otherwise *the day* as well as *the duty* would have been imperative without any repetition whatever. And *then*, prescription of the sabbath day as at the beginning and close of the commandment, would have been equivalent to prescription of the seventh

day ; and the indefinite, not the definite article would have been employed in the body of the statute. When the Author of language Himself speaks, and writes with His own finger what is spoken, it must be perfect.

How, then, can it be correct to say that “the seventh day is the sabbath of Jehovah” ? (Modern Sabbath Examined, p. 233.) It is the truth, but not the *whole* truth. The words in the commandment are significant : “the seventh day is *the sabbath* of the Lord *thy God*.” That which was the original sabbath of the Lord is now specially attached to the seventh day as “the sabbath of the Lord *thy God* !”

It is correctly observed by Dr. Owen on the the Hebrews, that the whole substance of the command is in the eighth verse (Exo. xx.) ; the *formal reason* whereof is contained in the last clause, “keep the *Sabbath day* to sanctify it.” “Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy” (Vol. ii. p. 405). It is evidently thus written with a definite meaning. It is a circumstance, surely, most weighty, that these are “*ipsissima verba*,” *the very words*, of Jehovah ; and not lightly to be attenuated by ingenious conjectures drawn from popular phraseology to meet the peculiar notions of men.

The same form is carefully preserved in another place. “Keep the *sabbath day* to sanctify it, as *the Lord thy God* hath commanded thee ; therefore *the Lord thy God* commanded thee to keep the sabbath day.” (Deut. v. 12, 15.) Here is a palpable reference to the primitive institution ; whilst the *seventh day* is not named, as this would have been only repetition, the law not being in delivery here. All this is, doubtless, intentional, and to show that in

the mind of God the principle of sabbatical institution is of primary and unchanging importance ; whilst the *peculiarity* of the seventh day was a mere temporary adaptation, and secondary in the eye of God to that universal and everlasting duty laid in the very “rudiments of the world.” And hence the same distinction is subsequently maintained ; and a marked difference is observed between the Mosaic institutions of a sabbatical *nature* and the *Sabbath* as originally prescribed. (Exod. xxxi. 13—18.) The language in the 15th verse of the 5th of Deuteronomy, proves that observance of the sabbath on the seventh day, by Israel, was *ceremonial* alone, and commemorative of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage. (Scott’s Comm. ; Exod. xvi. 4, 5 ; xxxiv. 21 ; xxxi. 12—18.)

It is indispensable to keep in view this distinction between the sabbath of the natural, and the prescription of the Mosaic covenant. Infidels have endeavoured to cast discredit on the institution, and on the Scriptures themselves, from what they choose to interpret as contradictory in the stated object of the appointment, by blind or wilful confusion of these distinctions. And it may deserve consideration how far an ascription of its origin to Moses may minister, not of course intentionally, to these designs. This fact is noticed by the “St. James’s Chronicle,” London newspaper, this very month (October, 1850), in a quotation from the notorious Paine.

“The Modern Sabbath Examined,” speaks of “the old covenant of Moses, and that ratified by Christ’s death.”

The old covenant is so denominated by St. Paul, when the Mosaic covenant is intended, for two reasons alone.

1. Because the Mosaic law was the old law of nature *adapted* to the Sinaitic institutions.

2. Because it was old relatively to an introduction of the gospel dispensation. And yet it was long subsequent to the new covenant promise of redemption in Christ. (Gen. iii. 15 ; xvii. ; Gal. iii. 13.) It is in this very contrast that the Apostle employs the expression in the Hebrews. (viii. 13.)

In strict scriptural sense that is the *old covenant* which has been "cast out with the bond-woman and her son," disinheriting her seed for ever. (Gen. xxi. 10 ; Gal. iv. 30.) But as no such decree has passed against Israel after the flesh in respect of *their* inheritance, but the reverse, so this must relate, not to their peculiar covenant, but to the old covenant law of works allegorized by Hagar. (Gen. xiii. 15.)

On Israel's deliverance from bondage, the sabbath, as the sign instituted both in the natural and Mosaic covenant, was renewed and ratified at Mount Sinai. (Gen. xv. 7—17, 18 ; xvii. 7—14, 23—27 ; Jer. xxxi. 34—40 ; Rom. xi. 1, &c.) It will be necessary to notice more particularly hereafter other features in the peculiar covenant of Israel.

The covenants allegorised in the Galatians are the *old covenant* of works, or of nature, and the *new covenant* of grace. But it is apparent, on the very face of the allegory, that the law of Mount Sinai was an adaptation of the first covenant law of nature. This is of collateral importance to the question at issue, because a sabbath can only "be cast out" with *Hagar and her son*, or so far as it was of Mount Sinai.

St. Paul asserts, (Gal. iv. 24,) that Hagar and Sarah, with their children, were an allegory of the old and new covenants ; that the history always indicated more than was conveyed in the mere narrative of facts. (Gen. xvi.

2—4 ; xxi. 1, 2.) And hence, he says, the new covenant “was confirmed before of God in Christ to Abraham.” (Gal. iii. 17 ; iv. 3.) And he quotes Sarah’s demand of Hagar’s expulsion, (Gen. xxi. 10,) generalising it as true of the respective seeds of the bond-woman and free-woman.

For these two covenants are not one and the same under different administrations alone, and both of grace. But the old covenant is of works alone, and the new covenant is of grace alone. (Rom. xi. 6.) The one is totally *opposed* to the other. The one is the *bond-woman*, and “gendereth to bondage.” (Gal. iv. 22—24.) The other is the *free-woman*, and *her seed are free-born*. They receive not the natural, alienable claims of sons, but the Spirit of sons and inalienable heirship to God in Christ. (Gal. iv. 3—7 ; iv. 31 ; v. 1.) Were it otherwise, the old covenant would be everlasting. But it was in effect, if not intent, decaying and evanescent. (Vide Tillinghast.) So it was in its adaptation to the Mosaic church.

Now this adaptation of the old covenant by Moses is plain. (Gen. xvii. 19 ; 2 Sam. xxiii. 5 ; Ezek. xvi.) For Hagar is both the old covenant opposed to that “confirmed before of God in Christ to Abraham,” and “Mount Sinai in Arabia.” (Heb. xiii. 20 : viii. 11 ; 2 Cor. iii. 7—11.) And not only so, but “Jerusalem that was *then*,” when the Apostle wrote his epistle to the Galatian church.—Jerusalem had both rejected and crucified the Lord Jesus ; persecuted His apostles and servants ; and, in blind attachment to a covenant, the nature of which they did not understand, was endeavouring, through her Judaizing converts, in Galatia and throughout the Gentile churches, to “render the truth of Christ

of none effect," (Gal. iii. ; iv. 21—31,) by adulteration of the gospel with the law. From this adaptation, then, by Moses the whole Mosaic institutions are designated by a generic expression, as *the law*. These attempted adulterations, therefore, would have alienated the privileges and liberties of the Israel of God.

Under the covenant allegorized by *Hagar* there was no pardon for offenders. Hence Ishmael's single transgression was visited with irrevocable condemnation. A stern prohibition was issued that he should be co-heir with the free-woman's son. He was banished from his father's house. The bond-woman herself was cast out, without any right which could be conveyed to her son. (Gal. iii. 10 ; iv. 30, 31.)

That old covenant is not only not life-giving, but "a ministration of death." (Jas. ii. 10, 11.) It was *abolished* as to its original power of securing life, by the qualification of a perfect righteousness ; and remained as imparting only the *knowledge and form of the truth*, in the primitive and immutable principles and rule of human duty. (Gal. iii. 21—24 ; 2 Cor. iii. 6—11.)

This old Covenant, as engrafted or adapted to the Mosaic institutions, is what St. Paul always means by *the law*, the *moral law*, where the signification is not otherwise qualified. Nor is this to be restricted to the Decalogue. The Decalogue comprises, doubtless, all the *principles of human duty*, the whole substance and conditions of the natural Covenant. And it is called therefore, "the tables of the Covenant ;" "the handwriting of ordinances." A significant expression, intimating that whatever principles these contain, they flow into those shadows of truth out of the comprehensive truth written by the hand of God Himself ;

as all goodness, in whatever form or modification, emanates from the Divine essence. And if Christ took away all transgression of "the hand-writing of Ordinances," &c., this must have comprised the whole law, or all man's natural duty ; and in this the Sabbath, part of the hand-writing, was included. And thus, the subordinate duty of the second table flows out of the primary duty of the first. There is no contradiction, therefore, in saying, that all moral truth is comprised in the Decalogue ; because moral truth in its subordinate and connective principles exists also in the whole of the Mosaic law. Thus, the judicial law contains principles of *natural truth*. The ceremonial law involves *evangelical truth* in types and shadows. And hence, the prescription in the fourth commandment concentrating the vitality of morals, and of social organization in the principle of worship, or of the *fear and honour* due to God as the Creator and Ruler of man ; is inseparable from the duty which is due to our neighbour. And the principle is retained in the Gospel precept, "Honour all men ; love the brotherhood ; fear God ; honour the king." (1 Pet. ii. 17.) Hence, it is introduced into all the three branches of the law, moral, ceremonial, and judicial. (See a book called *Elijah's Mantle*, by Tillinghast, A.D. 1658. Bishop Calc. Seven Sermons, Sermon. ii. pp. 37—53.)

The precept of our Lord, which comprises the whole duty of the second table of the Decalogue was known to the Jewish lawyer, and doubtless to all intelligent Jews, in the sense propounded by Jesus as comprehensive of the six commandments. It suggests a plain demonstration of the perfection of morals comprised in that summary of human duty.

To love our neighbour *more* than ourselves would be *unnatural*; to love him *less* than ourselves would be *selfish*, opposed to His image who “makes His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.” The Saviour seems to mark this, saying, “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.” (Matt. v. 46.) It is as much as to proclaim, “here is the image of God!” Does it not show, then, that this table prescribes the duty of man to man as a perfect being? And, to what source can it be rationally traced but to God’s natural law? And if all duty due to our neighbour be contained in this; and the two tables be inseparable and “*alike*,” what follows but that the *whole of human duty* towards God and man is, and was comprised in the Decalogue? To love our neighbour as *ourselves* is the original law of *equality*, the law of *perfection*, conformable to His image *who is love*.*

How can man express this Divine principle so fully as by an infusion of the soul’s affections into all that relates to his brother, identifying his benefit and pleasure with his own? And, if the Gospel precept, the “new commandment,” (not *new* in its inherent truth, but the old commandment which was from the beginning); if this be love, is it not evident that the law of man’s moral perfection is contained in the Decalogue; has survived the temporary adaptation of it to the system of Moses, is “*not destroyed, but fulfilled*,” in Jesus Christ; and thus, that the law is magnified, and made honourable by the Gospel? (Isa. xlii. 21; Rom. iii. 25—31; 1 Cor. xiii.)

The legislation of Moses to the Jews was, necessarily, grounded on the principle of legislation to the whole race of man.

A mistake, then, regarding the sabbath is no trifling matter. For, if it be part of God's moral law, and transferred to the Gospel, a denial of this not only deforms evangelical truth, but makes the Gospel an occasion of dishonour to that which it is God's will to honour, and not degrade.

"I have seen an end," says the Psalmist, "of all perfection ; Thy commandment is exceeding broad." (cxix. 96.) The "*perfection*" of obedience to the commandment has ceased, through the weakness and guilt induced by sin. The original nature of God's commandment (*i.e.*, the Decalogue expressed in the *concrete* form) remains unchanged.

(1). It is asserted, indeed, very confidently, that the fourth commandment is not in any respect moral, but that the whole Decalogue was abolished with the Mosaic dispensation ; and consequently all the Divine obligation to keep a day of holy rest at the same time.

(2). It is also said that "the foundations of human duty are not in the Decalogue, but in the human conscience ; whilst the other precepts," it is affirmed, "commend themselves to the human conscience, the fourth rests wholly on Divine prescription, and never could without it have suggested itself to the mind of man." (Modern Sabbath Examined.) Nay, more (3), "that the Decalogue was intended exclusively for the Jewish nation," &c.

(1). "The chief source of error in treating of this subject" (*i.e.*, the Covenant of works made on Mount Sinai), "seems to be that the commandments as delivered from Mount Sinai, and inscribed upon two tables of stone are confounded with the rest of the Jewish ceremonial and national laws, and their supreme

and universal authority merged in the general mass." (Universal Obligation of Fourth Commandment: Rev. J. Dingle, Withington, Salop.)

This author's object is to prove the moral obligation of the 4th Commandment, from "an essential identity of the Jewish and Christian dispensations." How could the Decalogue have been denominated the "Tables of the Covenant," but as comprising all the moral duty of man, as its *condition* under the law? (2 Cor. iii; Col. ii.) If it were "the hand-writing of ordinances against us; the ministration of death written and engraven in stones," then, surely, what entailed the *punishment* must necessarily comprise the whole duty.

Hooker discerns, "in the natural relations of a father and master, the spring of all natural law." (Vol. I. Eccl. Pol.) And it has been seen that the duty of worshipping God, and, therefore, of moral obedience to Him to a certain extent, arises in these relations between God and man. This is the rational interpretation of the Athenian inscription on the altar, erected "to the Unknown God." The apostle describes it as ignorant worship. But it is difficult to exclude an idea of the lingering remnant of original tradition, or of knowledge derived from the Jews even there.

But, so far as the *principle* of the fourth commandment is concerned, it may be questioned if any other *do* commend itself more substantially to "the human conscience." Let the *third* be tried by this peremptory rule! Nay, let even the *sixth* be selected with this view. If its *principle* arise in the truth that all things are God's, who constitutes, as the great Proprietor, the difference between *mine* and *thine*; and which the thief denies and contests; may it not admit of a doubt

if this would commend itself to the mind of a mere child of nature, not debased by evil habit, if such could be found ; and whose position in the world indoctrinates him in selfishness, so readily as that his god should be worshipped ? We know that even nations comparatively civilized have legalized theft, provided it comprehended a sufficient measure of deceit. And, looking at the allowed indulgences of the heathen, and the deliberate inculcation even of gross sin among the most civilised ; it is no wonder that Paley should say, “ Upon the whole it seems to me, either that there exist no such instincts as compose what is called the *moral sense*, or, that they are not now to be distinguished from prejudices and habits.” (Mor. Phil. Vol. I. p. 13.)

The simple fact of revelation implicates, surely, a necessity arising in man's natural ignorance of what is revealed. And if this be true, then the appeals to natural laws, found in the holy Scriptures, prove an *uncertainty* with regard even to these. Nor is this because of the mixed nature of some of these laws, as that of marriage grounded on a fact revealed : but of what is purely natural as well ; such as modesty of female apparel in the congregation. And, looking at the extent of moral truth revealed, not in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes alone, but throughout the Scriptures, and at the concentration of all moral duty in the Decalogue, it would appear to follow, that man's natural knowledge is very limited indeed ; and requires Divine direction and influence, even to what is known.

But if the *nine Commandments* be of a moral nature, and the *fourth* not moral at all, how is the coherence of the code to be sustained ? How could it be resolv-

able into one common principle, as it is by Jesus Christ? One apostle denominates it "the holy commandment," as another calls it, in its concrete principle, the "old, and new commandment of love." And Moses himself expressly denominates the Decalogue, "Ten Words." (Deut. x. iv. See Durham on the Commandments, A.D., 1675. p. 195.)

This author also well observes, that "if the *matter* (of the fourth commandment) be reducible to another command, then can it not be accounted distinct; neither ought it to have been given as such, but subjoined to some other; as the servants and beasts resting is subjoined to this." It must be both a strong and lucid argument that is to meet and refute this! And should it be proved that the foundations of human duty are *not* innate; then, on the ground stated, the morality of the Decalogue would be overturned altogether.

The Lord Himself combines, as one, the principle and duty of obedience to both tables of the decalogue: "Ye shall fear every man his mother and his father, and keep My Sabbaths." (Lev. xix. 3, 29, 30, &c.) "I am the Lord your God." The seventh-day Sabbath is united here to the other Sabbaths for worship, because these arise in the same principle; the nature and appointment, or will, of God. The one is of the *great commandment*, and the others like the commandment comprised in the table which is second only in order, are yet "like unto it" in principle or essence. For the man who loves God *must* love his neighbour, made in God's image. The principle of both the duties selected in this passage, is common. If the *one* arise in natural truth, so does the other. The two prescriptions are, evidently, selected to shew that a common principle must animate our duty to

God and man. And it is the very ground on which the prophet appealed to the Jews : “ If I be a father where is my honour ? and if I be a master ” &c. (Mal. i. 6.) * As the duty, then, prescribed in the fourth commandment comprises that of the three preceding, so the common spring of the whole decalogue is laid here as the ground of obedience to the fourth and fifth, viz. : the being or nature and covenant of God, “ I am the Lord your God.”

And, if the decalogue be carefully considered, the significance of this remarkable selection of two commandments, with the declaration of that truth which stands at the head of the whole ten ; it is, in fact, the decalogue *in short*. It is suspended on the principle enunciated in those two specified duties ; just as the Saviour suspended the whole law and the prophets, on the two great commandments.

For, *the first* commandment asserts the unity, eternity, and independence of God ; and the consequent dependence of all things upon Him.

The second claims His exclusive right to worship ; and its indispensable accordance with His will. Every offering of it, every thought of Him, finding its expression even in a vain utterance of His name, and arising in the mere will of man, fails, necessarily, of conformity to His nature ; and not only so, but must be untrue, degrading, and sinful. “ God is a Spirit ; ” an infinite Spirit ; and not to be represented by any sensible object whatever ; or conceived of by the mind of man.

And, hence, *the third* constitutes every acting of the soul towards God, which is not an act of worship, *Sin* : a *guilty* profanation of His name, nature, and truth : and

* Tract on the Ten Commandments, Rev. T. Scott, vid. 4th. Commandment.

it binds man negatively to the true worship and confession of the name of the Lord, "in spirit and in truth." They must be, as at first, an expression of the image of God.

The fourth, then, naturally, propounds *the law* of worship :—God's original law. It adapts that part of the first covenant to man's fallen condition, in all his relations, to his special covenant with Israel ; and with "the whole Israel of God," since that whole system of Moses was a shadow of His covenant in Grace, "making nothing perfect ; but bringing in that better hope," which "*did*."

It then points, in an expression of His immutable Majesty, to His own nature and will, pronounced in the primitive law of worship under the natural covenant, as *still unchanged*.

It was, evidently, the primary bond which held all things together. And such, as evidently, it remains. Nor, was it without reason, therefore, that the Jews were accustomed to say, "the Sabbath gives firmitude and strength to all the affairs of men." (Owen, on Heb., vol. ii., p. 213.)

And it is plain that obedience to this primary duty of man ensures obedience to all others. "I am the Lord thy God," is the one ground and reason assigned, why *both* duties are to be observed. This gives to the truth in this question a relation to all the practical duties of man.

As a dissolution of the *law of labour*, insidiously attempted about ten years ago, would have uprooted the social frame, reducing man to the savage state where each is dependant on himself, and careful for himself alone ; opening the flood-gates of wide spreading confusion, in an all absorbing selfishness of soul ; so, dissolution of the law of worship by the removal of all divine obligation ; and by the suspension of it on the will and

caprice of man ; would introduce chaos into the Church, worship of God, and all the moral duties of man, arising in one common source. In the wreck of the Church society would be destroyed.

Where the design of discontented spirits, therefore, has been to overthrow society, the Sabbath has always been a prominent object of their assaults. And certainly if only the weaker ground of observance be retained, even without any sinister views to social confusion, and if in consistency with these views the only restraints which such men regard be removed or withheld, because they are not believed to be legitimate subjects of human legislation, then, their lawless aims are so far promoted.

It is melancholy to observe the relaxed tone in which men speak and write of the moral, and divine obligation of "the Lord's day ;" to uphold it is to be feared, their real indifference to its sanctity, in an ignorance of vital godliness. They say, in effect, "*we leave you* to follow the dictates of your conscience, in the strictest respect which you can shew for the Sabbath. Why would *you* interfere with *our* letters of business ; *our* pleasures ; *our* recreations &c., or lord it over *our* consciences, by your puritanical restrictions on that day ?" And this, with many, passes for sense, and argument ! But what is it in truth ? "I leave you," says the drunkard, "to the absurdities of your total abstinence system ; and why should *you* wish to domineer over *my* enjoyments, by an attempt to put me in fear of the parish stocks ; or, by calling upon me for sureties to my good behaviour, according to your notions ?"

In *the minute details of Sabbatical duties and the sanction of Sabbatical law*, much important truth is suggested.

In those we discern the characteristic features of the natural covenant, viz., *perfection*. And thus the shadow of the law, the bondage of the fall, is thrown around the essential and immutable duties of man.

Death was the punishment of moral transgressions alone. For, life necessarily fails in our departure from the nature of Him who is its spring and fountain. And this awful penalty was exacted for the least transgression. This was, therefore, marked first in the case of an individual ; and finally in that of the whole nation of Israel. And this is, surely, a significant intimation to each person, and to collective bodies of men, of the solemn responsibility to which God holds both nations and individuals, in relation to His holy Sabbath ! When we, therefore, seek the legal restraint of those who have not any conscientious scruples about a profanation of the Sabbath ; (Num. xv. 32, 36 ; Lev. xxvi. 34, 35.) we are acting strictly in self-defence, and protecting ourselves as members of the state, and of society, not to say of the Church, against an injury in these relations. (Neh. xiii. 16, 18 ; Jer. xvii. 27 ; Ezek. xx. 12, 19, 21.) What is really attempted, therefore, is not a rational and natural liberty of conscience, but a *license* which is destructive of the public good. It will be said, doubtless, that abrogation of the Mosaic law has left these enactments without any force under this dispensation. But the reply seems both ready and decisive :—

1. The Sabbath did not originate with Moses.

2. That *the law* embodied all truth which related to man, both before and subsequent to that dispensation. It was, as observed before, “the form of knowledge, and of the truth.” (Rom. ii. 20.) Christ came to testify to this,—not to *destroy* it ; to *fulfil* it, in every “jot and

tittle :” to impart *life*, and *light* to that which sin had made *dark*, and even *deceitfully* in the natural mind ; and to restore those who were captives, and slaves, to the real liberty of the children of God. (Rom. vii. 13.) So that we have not only every principle of the law in the Gospel, but in its *perfection*, instead of *the form*, or *shadow*. And this appears to prove that there was a super-added *power*, even to man’s original knowledge of the duty comprised in *the truth*. Nothing has been lost, nor anything changed, in essential truth, from the beginning. We possess *everything*, everything perfected and perpetuated under the gospel. The nature, and relation of the law and the gospel can never be clearly discerned unless this leading fact be kept constantly in view.

From this combination of sabbatical ceremonies with original truth as to the day of holy rest, then, it may be learned that there is not anything *inconsistent* in the union ; nor is any argument derivable from it against the *morality* of the fourth commandment. The *ceremony* is merely the *shadow* which envelopes the truth ; and veils the promise of God ; so as to ensure integrity to the old condition of the covenant, in the provision of the New Testament relations of man.

So far, then, is it from the Decalogue being “intended exclusively for the Jews,” that no assertion, perhaps, could be more remote from the fact.

For the very opposite reason are the commandments recited in the New Testament. And why does St. James state that the violation of any “one point,” involves a violation of the whole “Royal law ;” unless the statute of the Sovereign were both so perfect in itself that destruction of the least portion affected the whole ;

and comprehensive of all his *subjects*, where there is not any specified exemption ? (James ii. 10.)

That the fourth commandment cannot be both *moral* and *positive* as to *its matter* is plain, because no instance exists of a law of this kind. (Durham, p. 200.) Either, then, it is a commandment without any substance, or, as its *positive* portion is not denied, so must it be *moral* as to its matter, and obligatory on all men, and *positive* only as to its *form*; and, thus, abolished with the law.

And why should there be *less* of morality in God's prescription of *a seventh day* for worship, than of *six days* for work ? As all time is His, and six sevenths of it are restricted by law to a certain use ; so the remaining seventh is consistently, and necessarily, denominated "*The Lord's Day.*"

Obedience to God is always a moral duty, whether or not we discern the nature and ground of His commands. The *master* or *father* cannot be *honoured* and *feared*, who is not obeyed, both when we know, and do not know, *why* his orders are issued. Nor is this deference due simply because the nature, or morality, of the prescription is plain to the mind. Our power to discern the nature of what is revealed, and to discover naturally this revealed truth, are widely different things ; and generally speaking they are contradictory things. For the general ground of revelation is human *ignorance*, and man's entire *dependence*, in all things upon God. These observations apply to the sabbath. It is not alone because it "commends itself to the conscience" that it is a moral duty to keep the sabbath holy ; but because it is both a natural duty to worship God, and a revealed duty to do this on the Sabbath of holy rest. What the law of nature requires from man, and what he could discover

of this without revelation, are separate and distinct questions. If reason suggest that God ought to be worshipped, yet, as Dr. Owen has observed, "the way in which this is to be done, and the portion of time which ought to be devoted to this purpose, cannot be known but by revelation." The duty, then, as a *whole*, in its principle and form, necessarily involves that which is both of a moral and positive nature. And so far is this, therefore, from any contradiction, that it arises *ex necessitate rerum*: in the immutability of the *principles* of human duty is not suspended our discernment of what God commands. Man is emphatically taught otherwise from the beginning, both as to the sabbath and the leading prescription by which all men were to be consigned to an eternal condition. It was the command, and will of God. And the most mysterious exercise of His grace, in the new covenant, is expressly referred to *the good pleasure of His will*; *a fulfilment of* "all the good pleasure of His goodness." (Ephes. i. 5.)

To say, then, of the fourth commandment, that it "never would have suggested itself to the mind," and that it is not therefore, moral at all; nor, consequently, of universal and perpetual obligation, is not true as to the *principle* and *substance* of the duty which it prescribes; but of that portion alone which prescribes the special mode of the duty; or, which was peculiar to the Jews, and passed away with the law which embodied that peculiarity, as "the seventh day; and the shadow of that *body* which is of Christ."

If the natural conscience of man, as influenced by knowledge of the nature, and relative positions of God and man suggested to him "the foundations of human duty," then, doubtless, these were "originally imprinted" there.

But does it follow, even if they were originally imprinted there, that they still remain? Distinct perception of moral truth, by the human understanding, would be, doubtless, indubitable evidence of duty. But this is a point very easily asserted; not so easily proved.

“The foundations of human duty” are in its *principles*. If these were originally imprinted on the human conscience and still remain there, man has not been injured in this respect by the fall. If, then, he possess within himself an infallible rule, and he must have been perfect in this as well as other things, the object of implanting this must remain, viz., that perfect obedience to which it directs. It would be as unerring in its indications, and as certain in its practical influence, as animal instinct. Otherwise man would still possess *perfect knowledge*, or the means of attaining moral perfection, which has never been realized in practical results, according to St. Paul, in any single instance! (Rom. iii. 10, 18.) But the end of all knowledge is not a mere illumination of the understanding, but a practical conformity of the whole man to the truth; “if ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.” *The duty* of perfect moral obedience to God is unchanged, and it is not suspended on our *knowledge*, but upon our entire dependence, both as creatures, and sinners, on the will of God. A perfect righteousness; nothing else, and nothing less, will the Lord accept. And it is the business of the law to point out, and insist upon, this duty, so as to convict every man of guilt under its impossibility, whilst the gospel provides the remedy, in a removal of this guilt, and by ensuring an attainment of this righteousness *before God*. God’s will inflexibly demanding this perfection it was marked at the beginning; and we may see traces still,

of this leading truth as to man in all things. It pervades, and regulates all things. And when the will of God is spoken of, it is not to be supposed that, as in man, its exercise can ever be the actings of a mere caprice. For its every operation must be perfection, and combine, therefore, the harmonious action of all the attributes of the Godhead, the consentaneous action of which must be necessarily implied. In *nature* we behold the same secondary causes productive of various, or even opposite effects. The earth, sun, wind, rain, &c., produce plants, flowers, colours, fragrance ; and impart healing, or destructive qualities to various medicinal plants, and herbs ; *as the Creator wills*. But, *the whole result* of natural operations is, undeniably, perfect, or some fatal disturbance must have ensued. The same word of God's truth is expressly declared to be both "a savour of life, unto life ; and of death, unto death." Not by a physical operation of truth, through some inherent power, as in the effect of light upon the eye, productive of vision, or, of fire resolving everything into its own nature, but on the same analogous principle which is laid down by the prophet. And the whole result in this case, as in all other things, will show the same perfect operation, when "the mystery of God shall be finished." (Rev. x. 7 ; see Taylor's Comm.)

And, hence it is, for one reason, that we have that sublime preface to the Decalogue as the basis upon which His proclamation of "the royal law" is reposed,—"**I AM THE LORD.**"

And hence, perhaps, David significantly denominates "the Ark of the Covenant," in which were deposited the tables of the covenant, and *near* to it the law, the bread from heaven, and the rod of His power, the emblem

of "the rod out of the stem of Jesse ;" *the footstool of our God.*" (Is. xi. 1 ; 1 Chron. xxviii. 2.)

It was the repository of that New and Old Commandment which places man at the footstool, and God on the throne.

There cannot be, surely, any higher reason for human obedience than the command of God ; which must always be the perfection of reason, whether we discern it plainly, or cannot perceive it at all. Nay, if it be "the glory of God to conceal a thing," then is man's obedience most honourable to God, where the ground of a precept is not understood.

The notion of an innate, natural impression of moral duty on the conscience of man arises, probably, in its supposed necessity to the moral responsibility of those who are excluded from all other sources of information. But what if the very darkness introduced by sin constitute part of its *guilt*, man's original responsibility remaining unabated, and the same, or rather more ; having *sin*, as well as *duty* to answer for before God ! It is certain that man *is* held responsible for the full extent of original perfection. And it appears equally certain that by the law *alone* can he know this, as will be presently proved. He *had* the Spirit of God ; was made in the image of God. He *had* personal access to God. And he *had* the natural light of reason "thoroughly furnished," as well as constantly prompted by the "still small voice" of God within. His soul was unclouded, and undisturbed by the conflict of the senses with the Spirit. Sin has not left him anything naturally but the dictates of reason to struggle with the fearful antagonism of the flesh.

If knowledge of the foundations "of human duty be imprinted on the natural conscience," it must be as a

means to some good, and kindred ends ; or to excite in man an *inclination* to perform all his duty to God. And one depends upon the other. The *understanding* is the avenue to *the heart*, the affections of which can only be excited by things that are known. If man know not, he cannot *love* his duty ; and if he love it not, he cannot be *inclined* to obey his duty. If, then, he possessed this knowledge of his duty, notwithstanding the fall, he must have lost the *love* of it, or he would retain the *inclination* which St. Paul absolutely denies. (Rom. vii. 7—11.)

And, supposing man to be thoroughly acquainted, naturally, with his duty, or “the foundations of human duty,” which must amount to the same thing, as our Lord concentrates the whole in one word, yet, this alone would not avail without an inclination to obey. For this information *is* actually supplied in the law. Nay, we shall presently see that the very reverse is an effect of its communication. And, thus, it is said by the prophet, “the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint,” the mind and affections are in some way proportionably deranged. Not by any direct physical change in the faculties of the soul, from good to evil, or by an implantation of an evil, in the place of a good quality in the soul ; but *privatively*, in a withdrawal of the Spirit of truth. The mainspring of vitality in the soul, so to speak, is gone ! This is restored in the “law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus,” our second head ; the fountain of “grace and truth.” And, hence, it is well observed by an old writer, “we never find grace and peace united in the Old Testament, nor ever separated in the New.” And why ? The characteristic feature of the one is *the law*, which enjoins a perfection no man

can attain, and which “worketh wrath,” therefore, not peace.

It is easy for those who walk in the light of revelation to talk about *the religion of nature* ; *the light of nature* ; and *the light of natural conscience*. But, is it, indeed, easy to divest the mind of all knowledge derived through revelation ; and to reason as a thoughtful, but wholly unenlightened, uninstructed child of nature ? It appears quite possible that systems worked out in this way might begin at the roof, whilst the structure was supposed to rise from the foundation. To say that a natural light (1 Cor. xi. 14, 15 ; ii. 11), exists in man is only saying that God has endued him with a reasonable soul. But he is responsible both as a *rational* creature, and as the seed of one fallen from *perfection*. To say, however, that “the foundations of human duty are imprinted on the natural conscience,” would be, virtually, to insist that the moral injury of the fall has been partial alone, and that man’s original intelligence and knowledge of duty were so far independent of the holy Spirit, and the dictates of revelation.

Before speaking of our natural knowledge of duty, I would advert briefly to that striking description of man, as redeemed, and restored from the ruins of the fall “renewed in the spirit of your mind ; the new man created in righteousness, and the holiness of truth ;” “renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him !” (Ephes. iv. 23, 24 ; Col. iii. 10, Bible margin.)

He is, therefore, restored to his former state of *mind*, in “the knowledge” which he had when created after the *image of God* ; and which was *lost*, therefore, by the fall. The tone, temper, and spiritual power of his understanding are restored, in a measure, so that this may excite

spiritual *affections*, and determine his *will* towards “spiritual things,” or towards that holiness to which “truth” directs, and which the Spirit of truth imparts power to “follow” in the ways, righteousness, and providence of the “God of all truth.” And this is expressly affirmed to be “the renewing of the Holy Ghost.” The true moral, and spiritual sense of man is here, and here alone. It is a renewal which moulds him as a “new man,” into the old image, substitutes a *spiritual*, for the *carnal mind*, sheds in the heart the *love* of God for “enmity” against Him, and love of the image of God in his brother, for the love of self alone ; *life* for *death* ; and peace with God, for a conscience defiled, troubled, and afraid. It is not an operation which supplies a *mere defect*, arising in the fall ; but a *new creation* in Christ complete and “perfect in all the will of God ;” or, in all the essential properties of “righteousness, and the holiness of truth.”

Broad and sweeping conclusions, comprehensive of fallen man, have been unwarrantably drawn from special instances of apparent discoveries of moral truth among the heathen. These are of very questionable origin and authority indeed. Who can separate what was derived from tradition, what was variously communicated through the survivors of the deluge, and more recently through the Jew from the simple emanations of the human mind ? Even now the modern researches of the indefatigable and intelligent Layard, in the ruins of Nineveh, are evolving out of the silence and darkness of thousands of years what are plainly *mythological* representations of the earliest scripture facts, and recorded probably by the descendants of Shem. Egyptian hieroglyphics present palpable traces of a kind of sacred

stenographic and emblematical representation of original truth, and which had, doubtless, descended from the son of Noah to these children of Ham.

Hooker thinks that *Plato* discovered *prayer* to be a natural duty ; and it appears certainly to be an inference inseparable from the duty of worship. But we cannot forget the dark notions of Baal's priests, living even in immediate contact with *the law*. The faint outline of original truth is discernible, too, through the thick veil of idolatrous corruption even there ! *The blood, and the best*, even their own blood ! (1 Kings xviii. 26, 28.) Who does not remember again our Lord's description of the creed of the heathen as to prayer ; "*they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking ?*" This undoubtedly true description of their very thoughts, in these "*vain repetitions*," still suggests the notion of *the most perfect offering*. Besides, universal existence of sacrifice, which, if not essentially prayer in itself, expresses outwardly, an intention of the mind to propitiate the Being to whom it is made, and the transition to vocal expression of the thought, appears inevitable, as a concomitant act. These *corruptions* of idolatrous worship must have been posterior to the primitive truth, which they have overlaid and obscured.

Hooker also thought that *Plato* discerned the two great commandments of the law : and the immortality of the soul. (Eccl. Pol., vol. I., pp. 148, 262. Deut. vi, 5. Matt xxii, 38.) I select this instance as a decisive illustration of the fallacy of those data from which such conclusions have been drawn.

Now *Plato* died 348 years before the christian era, at the age of 81. The Hebrew scriptures were translated into Greek about 300 years before Christ, for the benefit

of the numerous Jews resident in Alexandria, through the favour of one of the Egyptian Kings. This translation, therefore, was in being when Plato was 33 years old : and five years after he had commenced his travels in the pursuit of knowledge. It is not impossible, surely, that he might *see* them : nor that he might have conversed with Jews, so as to derive much information on the moral principles of duty. Their custom of establishing synagogues is well known, and we have traces of attendance by idolatrous natives, in the Acts. In the time of Solomon we are informed that there were in Israel 153,000 strangers. Their annual attendance at Jerusalem from all places, too, must have attracted attention, and most probably would add heathens to the concourse of Jews. (Acts ii, 5.) John xii. 20. 1 Kings xx. 34.) One learned man attributes the prophet's appellation of the Messiah to these facts, "*The desire of all nations shall come.*" (Hodges on Job.)

Everything attests, indeed, an internal universal aspiration of the soul of man towards something certain and satisfying ; but never attained until he is enlightened and directed infallibly by Revelation. Well, therefore, might an astonished heathen exclaim, on hearing the first verse of our inspired scriptures declare that "*in the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth,*"—"ah ! that makes everything plain!"

The great peculiarity of Jews, indeed, was their difference in religion from all the world. This would naturally excite the curiosity of thoughtful Gentiles. And as the Jews notoriously contracted and engrafted on their own pure system heathen errors and abominations, so might they communicate many important truths, which heathen philosophers, like Plato, would adopt and

introduce into their own ethics, safe from discovery in the recondite sources from which they had been derived, as their pride, prejudices, and selfish passions might suggest.

Their *silence* on the sources of their information is not at all wonderful. Their practice as to other events in the history of God's favoured nation, and which must have been more notorious than appears from their writings, is consistent. Such is their application of the stars of heaven to the purpose of recording passing events. We find little, or not any notice of Israel's passage through the Red sea ; their wanderings and miraculous sustenance in the desert. And there are traces of knowledge derived from that people without an allusion to the source. (Hales' Chronol.) Where reference is made to the Jewish history it is mostly in a spirit which indicates little sense of justice. We cannot, therefore, expect confessions which would implicate a knowledge in the despised Jew, superior to that of the proud and self-complacent Gentile. When Tacitus alludes to the miracle at Marah, and he has been considered partial both to Christians and Jews, it is to express the common feeling of contempt for that people. He says "they worship the image of an Ass's head in their temple, because by following wild asses in the wilderness, when perishing with thirst, they had been led to a spot where water was found." (Owen on Hebs. vol. ii. p. 295.)

Hooker, indeed, says "that little which some of the heathens did chance to hear, concerning such matter as the sacred scripture plentifully containeth, they did in wonderful sort affect ; their speeches, as oft as they make mention thereof, are strange, and such as themselves could not utter as they did other things, but still

acknowledged that their wits, which did everywhere else conquer hardness, were with profoundness here over-matched." (Eecl. Pol. vol. 1. p. 188.)

Longinus, one of the greatest heathens, quotes the inspired account of the first act of creation, as the most remarkable instance of the *sublime*, in his work on that subject—" *God said let there be light.*" (Pierce's Ed. Longinus, p. 51.)

The following extract is from a letter in the *Church and State Gazette*, of Sept. 8, 1848, signed, Presbyterian A. M. It was occasioned by Paley's asserted plagiarism, from Dr. Nieuwentyt, or Pearson on the creed, of his well known illustration of the watch.—

"Solomon says '*there is nothing new under the sun.*' I may illustrate this by showing, that as probably Paley borrowed much from the ethics of Aristotle, so Aristotle himself borrowed from other sources.

"A Jew, who kept a bazaar, came one day to my rooms to exhibit a bill of his goods ; he saw a volume of Aristotle lying upon the table, took it up, and read it with great fluency. I was intended, said he, for a Rabbi, and these matters were once familiar to me. Does it not, he continued, sometimes strike you that you have read much of this in another place ? Yes, I replied, I sometimes think that there are parts of the Bible very like what I occasionally meet with in this book. Exactly so, said he : and no wonder. When Alexander visited Jerusalem it is not probable that he would forget his tutor's request to send him the learned works of the nations he conquered. We may, therefore, readily suppose that Aristotle was not ignorant of the writings of Solomon ; and there are obvious reasons why he should not acknowledge the sources whence he derived what-

ever he might choose to borrow from our sacred books. I have frequently since thought of the Jew's remark : and it seems very probable that he was not far wrong."

I was glad to read this letter, some months, indeed, after these pages, on the same subject were written. The Jew's conclusion has been very long the conviction of my own mind ; and often has this been publicly avowed by me on the platform of the Bible Society, as one of its agents.

Can it be doubted that light was shed on the corrupted traditions of various nations, from the wanderings of Abraham and his posterity ; when we behold proof in Scripture that knowledge of the true God was not wholly extinct ? Or, that light did not arise, to some extent, on the prevalent darkness of Gentile nations, in their contact with the Jews throughout the history of that wonderful people ? With the Assyrians, Chaldeans, &c., &c. ? When Cyrus conquered Babylon he would inevitably learn that his very name had been foretold in the sacred books ; and through Daniel their contents must have attracted his notice. Thus would these records find their way into the East. Succeeding conquerors, down even to the Romans, would see the traces of knowledge thus derived. Who can forget Aristotle's dying exclamations ?

"Fœdè in hunc mundum intravi,
Anxious vixi : perturbatus egredior :
Causa causarum, miserere mei !"

"Uncleanly I entered into this world :
Anxious have I lived, (in a life of doubt ;)
Thoroughly disquieted am I going out of it :
Cause of causes, have pity upon me !!!"

What a pitiable complication of glimmering knowledge ; of a life filled with miserable doubts, and fears ; a desire of mercy ; and ignorance of the way in which this was to be secured !

This philosopher died 322, B.C. Hooker often quotes from him, as if the philosopher were writing the effusions only of his own mind. It is not difficult, however, to see how ready of transmission the knowledge derived by him, as described, was to *Plato*. Aristotle bequeathed his manuscripts to Theophrastus ; to whom Hooker refers. (Vol. i. p. 146.) They were purchased by one of the Ptolemies for the Alexandrian library. And Andronicus, a philosopher of Rhodes, published the works of both about 59, B.C. (Lempriere.)

Now it is quite possible that Plato obtained much information from Aristotle himself. He was contemporary with him, and 55 years old when Aristotle died. After the death of Socrates, his tutor, Plato travelled through various parts of Greece. The practical doctrine of morals was a leading object of his study. And the man who had seen the compositions of the wise son of David, would be the very person to satisfy his mind.

There is another side of the picture, and much more decisively expressing the unprompted and corrupted effusions of the human mind. One instance is enough, in the lines of a translator. And if moral truth stand in inseparable affinity to the nature of God, gross darkness is, indeed, the real characteristic of the natural mind. The poet speaks thus as an instructor in the nature of God !

“ Rich in themselves, to whom we cannot add,
Not pleased by good deeds, nor provoked by bad.”

The statements of St. Paul in the second chapter of

his Epistle to the Romans have been made, needlessly it appears to me, an occasion of confusion and error. (Rom. ii. 6—16.)

It has been assumed that St. Paul speaks there only, or chiefly, of men left entirely to the dictates of natural conscience, and not at all of persons in intercourse with those better informed than themselves. But many things concur to lead to a qualified conclusion. Should this be the fact, then, the inference which has been drawn from the position of one of these two classes alone, must be proved partial, and erroneous. “The mixture of those things by speech which by nature are divided, is the mother of all error.” (Hooker, Eccl. Pol., vol. i. p. 249.)

The leading subject of this Epistle is the nature of “the gospel of Christ.” It takes its rise in the fifteenth verse of the first chapter. An amplification of *this subject* follows in the next verse ; and this is succeeded by a complete definition of the gospel, so as to embrace its relation to the law, and include the principle through which the gospel is effectual to salvation. “For, therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith ; as it is written, the just shall live by faith.” Or, “therein is the righteousness of God revealed, as arising in faith,” and assured to him that truly believes. For, as the one preposition points to *the origin* of this righteousness of God in the principle of faith, so does the other indicate *that end* in which it terminates ; viz., assurance in Christ ; the believer’s only ground of hope for acceptance as *righteous before God*. And this stands in evident opposition to that in which the *original* righteousness of man was to consist, viz., his own personal merit and qualification before God, and not that of another.

Having thus introduced the subject of the law of

nature, he affirms its condemnation of "all ungodliness," even of that sin which offends against the natural light by which all men are convinced that there is a God their Creator and Ruler; and, from this inevitable conviction, of the consequent duty to honour and fear Him.

Whatever might be the demoralized and sinful condition of men, anywhere, it is traced to their own wilful departure from God; and a deliberate violence offered in the first instance, to what *God had shewed unto them*; and in the next, to the convictions of their own mind. Now, one of two conclusions as to such persons might be drawn by men ever prone to judge others, viz., either their universal condemnation or acquittal. He, therefore, resumes his subject as to man's natural condition; that in which his statement of the nature and effect of the gospel arose. Under *all* circumstances the responsibility of man to the natural light of conscience, which "*accuses or excuses*" its transgressions, as well as to the law or covenant of nature is asserted, for God "*will render to every man according to his deeds.*"

It is inferred, however, by some, that one class is mentioned here for whom it is necessary to find a place in the eternal world; *i. e.* those who under the light of natural reason alone act conformably with its dictates. I believe that the apostle chiefly speaks of the Jew, *having the law*; and of the Gentile coming into *contact with the law*; from the first to the end of the eleventh verse of the second chapter. From the twelfth to the end of the fifteenth verse of that chapter, he speaks parenthetically of the Gentile living solely under the light of reason; and at the seventeenth verse he returns to the subject thus interrupted, so far as the Jew was concerned. It was natural, if not necessary, that in writing to Gentiles

in contact with the law, he should thus incidentally shew that there was not any child of man left lawless and unaccountable, because of God's *special* revelation of His law to the Jew ; as this was, in its general features, only the revelation originally given to all mankind ; and never abolished, nor even relaxed. As to the final condition of the class named, he speaks alone there of the punishment of sin. He does not, as it appears to me, say anything whatever, from which we can *certainly* conclude either that any *do* walk according to this light, or decide as to their eternal condition. Is anything more meant than to assert the superiority of the mere Gentile, when obeying his natural light over those living under, or in contact with, but disobeying the perfect light of revelation ? Their eternal state is not mentioned. It is left among the secret things of God. We have not ground on which to condemn, or acquit. All that we have to do with, and consider, is, the certain, universal, and fearful punishment of sin.

And this is the more needful, when it is remembered that St. Paul's object was to show that the justification of man before God, was by faith alone in Christ, and so to maintain the righteousness of God, manifested by the law and the prophets." (iii. 21, 22.) He asserts, indeed, that "faith cometh by hearing."

Whilst the Gentiles, in contact with the law, then, are *chiefly* kept in view, yet, those destitute of this advantage are incidentally named throughout, as necessarily included on the ground of man's universal responsibility to the law of God ; which is specially insisted on in the seventh chapter. This double view is sustained through the body of the epistle. Nor, is the statement so awfully depicted in the first chapter, at all inconsistent

with the moral debasement even of Greeks and Romans. (Paley, Vol. I., chap. v., pp. 6—13. Lev. xx.)

A candid interpretation of the context will harmonize with this view. The parties in the apostle's mind, in the first chapter appear to be those under the law :—“the Jew and the Greek.” (ver. 16.) The conclusion is consistent : “who, knowing the judgment of God,” &c. (ver. 32.) It is neither an uncommon nor unaccountable thing, for men who love sin to affect a repulsion from sinners. The condition described by the apostle marks a fearful advance on the broad road of destruction ; for they had passed from hypocrisy to profaneness.

This knowledge of God's judgment is not that alone of which the Psalmist speaks, “When Thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world learn righteousness.” (See a Sermon by the Rev. Chas. Parsons, Reichall, Dublin. Published by request.)

The *responsibility* of man, therefore, is not precisely measured by his knowledge of duty, but by the law of God : that which identifies all men as the common offspring of a sinner. Each transgressor is doubly inexcusable, and doubly guilty. For the posterity of Adam are implicated in his sin, and condemned by their own demerit ; guilty as offenders, in every case against the light of the reasonable soul, and of the darkness superinduced by original transgression.

We may take the case of every idolater, even of the darkest, in illustration. Idolatry is repugnant to the plainest dictates of man's understanding, and inflicts a wilful violence on the natural conscience, as the constituted judge of its intelligent operations.

As a straight line is not only *right*, or *straight* itself, but the *measure*, in a sense, of that which is crooked ; so, that which is *true*, as every reasonable thing is, is not only so, but a measure likewise or rule, by which everything unreasonable or false may be judged. And thus, every child of man sees from the creation of the world, as all effects follow some cause, that all things must have had either a *first* cause or author, or they must have made themselves, and have been both cause and effect. Then they would have been both before and after themselves ; or they must have arisen in nothing ; and then, that which had not any being, must have been creative of being ; or, they must have been everlasting ; and be, therefore, God !

In this way the mind arrives necessarily at a first cause ; without cause ; the cause of all things ; before all things ; and eternal.

But every idolater knows that his idol had a beginning ; and more, that it will, even if untouched by the finger of man, come to an end. He knows, and cannot but know, that his idol is unable to move itself out of harm, or into the way of good. And hence, the natural sense of the African prince responded in a moment to the missionary's question, " If he thought his god, which could not defend itself from the fire that burned his temple, could protect him from mischief ? And much less, then, can it originate *secondary* causes of good or evil. And so, St. Paul says, " We know that an idol is nothing in the world." (1 Cor. viii. 4.)

Whereas God, the one God, Creator of all things, before all things, and upholding all things, must be

Omnipotent, Omniscient, and Omnipresent, as well as Eternal.

Moreover, the darkest idolater knows that his idol can neither see him when in its presence, nor hear his prayers, nor move to his help or harm. He knows that he can burn his god if he will, and render its end as plain as is its beginning.

On these grounds, apparently, the prophet makes his nervous appeal to idolaters, adding the reason of their blindness, and ascribing it to the same cause as that of the Gentiles by St. Paul:—"They have not known nor understood, for He hath shut their eyes that they cannot see.....he feedeth on ashes," the unnatural and destructive act of a corrupted appetite ; of a madman, in fact ; so that men judicially blinded alone, can be sincere idolaters, and say to the senseless stock, "Thou art my god." A deceived heart hath turned him aside." "God hath sent them strong delusion that they should believe a lie," even the most subtle and refined. (Eccles. x. 2 ; Jer. x. 8.) "The stock is a doctrine of vanities." "A wise man's heart is at his right hand, but a fool's is at his left." Although the truth be as near to his mind as the right hand to his body ; and ready of perception as that member for use ; yet he is deluded by vitiated affections through a mind depraved, into belief of an obvious unnatural lie ! (See Taylor's Catechet. Exercises. A.D. 1650.)

A few scattered points may be noticed briefly, confirmatory of this general view of the Epistle to the Romans.

The conclusion in the second chapter and first verse, deduced from the Apostle's preceding statements, iden-

tifies, in some sense, those of whom he had spoken in the first chapter, with those mentioned in the second. After his well-known declarations in the second chapter, and when he had resumed his topic as to Gentiles in contact with the law, he declares, "the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written." (ii. 24.) There cannot be any mistake here. His argument, so far as it concerns the Gentiles, applies to this portion of them, and to Christianized Jews, or Judaizing believers. In the course of this argument, he states that no man had any excuse for sin. He reminds the Jews, whose self-complacency and licentiousness were so dishonourable to their religion,—of the ancient national sin, so awfully reprobated and punished by God. "When they entered into the heathen whither they went, they profaned My holy name, when they said unto them, *these are the people of The Lord, and are gone forth out of their land.*" (Ezek. xxxvi. 20—23.) The heathen pointed the finger of scorn at their religion and their God, on beholding their inconsistency and wickedness, saying, "If such be the Lord's people, and such His care of them and their country, which we have conquered, making them our slaves, what sort of a God must the Lord himself be!" What a lesson and warning to the inhabitants of these favoured realms, in their intercourse with idolaters in our own days!

We find him pursuing his main subject in the next three chapters, and holding forth the way of man's justification before God, after a detail of his special mercies to the Jews, and pre-eminently in their possession of the written record of His truth. (iii. iv. v.) In the *seventh*, after asserting God's immutable demand of a *perfect righteousness* by the law, (vii. 1—4,) only to be

fulfilled by new relations in Christ, he gives two reasons for the necessity of this provision in the Gospel, viz., the spiritual nature of the law ; and the carnal nature of man. (vii. 5—15.) This he confirms by an appeal to that internal ceaseless conflict maintained by the flesh, when, even with the Spirit's aid, the believer would subdue that principle of lust which opposes and obstructs his obedience to the perfect rule of God in the law. (vii. 16—25.) In the next chapter, he shews, however, our certain release under "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," from *all* the consequences of sin ; its condemnation, dominion, and inward torment of the conscience ; —the present assurance and peace by the witnessing Spirit of God ; and certain final deliverance of body and soul into "the glorious liberty of the children of God." Then "the whole creation" will arise with man from the common grave of corruption and bondage in which they have been laid by sin. The three chapters following relate to the Jews. They prove a deep interest in the prospects of his nation, and shew that the principle of that Covenant, of which they were at once the representatives and vehicle to the Christian church, was inalienable, and attaches also to the chosen people of God. That a temporary *suspension* was not the final rejection of their peculiar relations in the favour of God. That "the fulness of the Gentiles being brought in," then the reflux of divine favour in the reception and salvation of the Gentiles would bring in the full tide of God's love on the seed of Abraham, that they might be both blessed and a blessing to the world. The rest of his epistle is devoted to those practical duties and relations to which the Gospel imperatively calls all the disciples of Jesus, living as they do under a system

which, in all its privileges and liberty from legal bondage, is pre-eminently a law of holiness, peace, and love.

The knowledge, then, of which the Gentile Apostle speaks in the second chapter, as naturally open to the mind of man, is that which may be learned from the being and attributes of God, so far as these are legible by the reason of man, in the works of creation. And he seems to distinguish this limited knowledge from that possessed by the Jews, and those enlightened through their means. He calls it *a law*, but “not *the law*.” What is done under this light, they “do by nature.” But how forcibly do the words of Job apply to knowledge thus derived! “Lo! these are parts of his ways: but how little a portion is heard of Him:” (xxvi, 14, 15.) “but the thunder of His power who can understand!” He speaks of “their conscience,” because knowledge of duty is the necessary foundation of conscience. Conscience is, literally, a knowledge joined to a knowledge, implying both the soul’s consciousness of, and God’s privy to, all impressions on the mind.

There is, however, one instance alone of the operations of *natural conscience* under a *full* and clear knowledge of human duty. (Gen iii. 7—10.) It is not to be supposed, surely, that sin had destroyed the memory of Adam, any more than “the second death” will annihilate the memory of sinners. He knew, but no longer loved, his duty, because love is of the Spirit. (Phil. ii.; Col. i. 8.) If “the carnal mind be enmity against God,” it must be inimical to man’s natural duty to God. If his duty were known, then he knew that he had lost the power of “establishing his own righteousness;” the favour of God, the privilege and desire of personal fellowship, the reward of obedience, and that he had

incurred the penalty of mortality and death. He fled, therefore, self-condemned, ashamed, and afraid. But, can any natural man stand in the precisely same condition? Taking hold, as Adam did, of both states, original and fallen? The Teacher had departed! Delight in his instructions had vanished! But the lesson remained!

And how dark and erroneous, even in his case, was the very first step under this operation of natural conscience on fallen man! He sought to cover his own shame! To escape from the presence of God! To hide himself, and avert, perhaps, the punishment of his sin! The Apostle calls this sanction of the law in the natural conscience, "the work of the law written in their heart." (ii. 15.) And subsequently, he defines this: "the law worketh wrath, for, where no law is, there is no transgression." (iv.) But, as "all have sinned," all must be in some sense under the law. This explains their "knowledge of the judgment of God." (ii. ult.) There must, indeed, be correspondence between these rational convictions, and the light and truth inherent in the law, accordant to their extent. It is written "in their hearts;" because the affections of the soul towards known truth necessarily enter into a good or evil conscience, just as faith operating to righteousness, makes men believers in the heart. The more carefully, then, this is considered, the more remote does it appear from fact, that "the foundations of human duty are imprinted in the natural conscience." Were the moral responsibility of man dependent on the precise extent of his knowledge of duty, they who are most in the dark must stand in the best position. In that which is natural, also, we look for *uniform* results. But, in the

varieties of mental power, there would necessarily exist as many varieties in human conceptions of duty as there are human beings. The natural darkness induced by sin, through the withdrawal of the light of the Spirit, constitutes, as before said, a part of the *guilt* of original sin, without obliterating one letter of that law over which it has shed such a deep and impenetrable shade.

“What the church of God standeth bound to know, or do, the same in part nature can teach them, but only in part, neither so fully as is required for man’s salvation, nor so easily as to make the way plain and expedite enough that many may come to the knowledge of it and so be saved, therefore in scripture God hath collected the most necessary things that the school of nature teacheth unto that end, and revealeth also whatsoever we neither could with safety be ignorant of, nor at all be instructed in, but by supernatural revelation from Him.” (Eccl. Pol., vol. 1. p. 250.)

The law in its extended sense comprises all that God at first required of man ; and is therefore called, as concentrated in the fear of God and obedience to his commandments, “*the whole of man.*” Of this law the apostle declares that it is “fulfilled in one word, in this, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” (Gal. v. 14.) The *second table* is *specified*, but the *principle* of obedience to this necessarily implies obedience to the other. For real love of the brethren is a recognition and love of God’s image in His people, as “God is love.” And the love of His perfections is the love of Himself. Hence the apostle, referring to the whole law, subsequently says “love is the fulfilling of the law.” (Rom. xiii. 8, 10.) This commandment, says the beloved disciple of Jesus. “have we from Him, that he who loveth God love his

brother also, and every one that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God." (1 John iv. 7, 8, 12, 13, 21.) The christian knows and loves God, and discerns therefore, and loves His image, wherever it may be seen. But since "we love him because he first loved us," (1 Jno. iv. 19.) the principle, or foundation of moral duty is extrinsic to man, and the real foundation must be the subject of divine revelation, as at the beginning.

If it be a principle of universal application, that "the natural man discerneth not spiritual things : " (1 Cor. ii. 14, 16.) and if human duty, as comprised in the Decalogue, upon which "hang all the law and the prophets," be of a spiritual nature in its principles, then is it not discernible by the natural mind. The apostle says, "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, just, and good." And, as if it were to obviate misconception, he says immediately, "the law is spiritual." This is also in the very chapter where the immutable obligation of the moral Law, demanded at the beginning, is insisted on in the most positive manner. He is, at other times, careful that his meaning should not be misunderstood when adverting to the ceremonial law, and calls it "the law of commandments in ordinances ; weak and beggarly elements ; observances of days, and months, and times, and years." (Gal. iv. 9, 10. Eph. ii. 15.)

Such is the obscurity induced, and the power exercised by the senses over the purely natural mind, that the Holy Spirit employs the same word to designate the *nature* of fallen man, and to describe his *condition* as contrasted with his original state, "sensual," or "having not the spirit." (ψυχικος.) (Gen. ii. 7. Jude 19. Jas. iii. 15. Margin.)

There are various incidental proofs in the Romans to

the same effect. The Jew, he says, had "the form of knowledge, and of the truth in the law." (Ro. ii. 20.) Of that law doubtless, which "came by Moses;" and which is only another word for "truth," named in the next member of the sentence: to bear witness to which was the great object of Christ's Advent. (Jno. xviii. 37.) Both Moses and Jesus established one religion, one truth; the same religion in substance. The one presented it in its *form* and *shadow*; whilst the other imparted substance and life by the grace of the spirit. That which was the "old commandment from the beginning," remains "the new commandment" to the end. To this truth Jesus testified, and made it the "law of the spirit of life," by His grace. It manifests "God as its author, righteousness as its substance, and the attainment of this righteousness by fallen creatures as its end." (Tit. ii. 11; Rom. vi. 14; viii. 1, 2.) This was always the religion of God. But further still—He asserts not only that the *moral law is known through revelation, but that a clear perception of it excites in the natural mind a deeper hostility to its prescriptions!* (Ro. iii. 20; vii. 7, 8.)

As "sin is a transgression of the law," so this knowledge refers to the law transgressed; and His assertion, that "by the law is the knowledge of sin," is tantamount surely to saying that by the law is the knowledge of duty; and in no other way; for as sin comprises all transgression so does this "*knowledge*" comprise the whole of human duty. And as referred to his declaration, relative to the purely Gentile mind, it is plain that he means there partial knowledge, and here its complete revelation. That it is the *moral law* is evident; for it is that which can only be made void in its obligations

by an interest in Christ ; and not only so, but that complete revelation of duty which is perverted by the natural man, even to riot, in the desire of everything opposed to its prescriptions. The law intended is evidently that which is contained in the Decalogue, for he mentions that principle of the tenth commandment which originates each violation of its prescriptions ; and is that which in the negative form, as love in positive form, ensures obedience to the law of God. This law then, which reveals to man his duty, is at variance with human nature, which must be naturally lawless. (1 Tim. i. 9.) But how could this be, were its foundations inherent in the very nature of man ? To this extent, surely, as in every other natural principle, they would be in *agreement*, not in opposition. To whatever extent this "*law written on the heart*" of every natural man may enlighten its subject, it must form part of the duty which is *perfectly* revealed in the scriptures ; and hence the whole of christian duty, illuminated by the full revelation and grace of the spirit, is still in its nature, "a reasonable service." What is true then of the knowledge that is *perfect*, must be true likewise of this limited information. Hence there is something which is as universally *wanting* as it is *needful*, to render the *knowledge* of duty, be this less or more, practically availing. What is this but proof of the common loss by sin, and of the common necessity for restoration by the spirit ? Mere light, nay perfect light, communicated to the mind, is "weak through the flesh." If it be so, when revealed infallibly by God, what must it be, under the faint glimmerings of the natural mind ? Like those characters of truth written by the finger of God on the tables which Moses broke under the Mount. Moreover,

St. Paul says that the principle which originates all *disobedience* is the subject of revelation alone. (Ephes. v. 13.) "I had not known lust, except the law had said thou shalt not covet." (Rom. vii. 7.) It is easily seen how this evil principle originates the violation of every commandment in the Decalogue. The fourth prescribes what portion of life shall be devoted to God's worship, and the cultivation of holiness. Man, influenced by worldly and carnal desires, business, or pleasures, misapplies this portion in the gratification of these feelings of the sensual heart, and violates the precept of God. And how fatally must lust operate, when, but for the prohibition revealed, man would be unconscious even of its presence in the soul!

So that the foundation of *disobedience*, as well as of *obedience*, to moral duty is a subject of pure revelation from God.

The moral Law has not lost anything of its original obligations, but is fulfilled in its transference to the covenant of Christ. (Deut. xviii. 15—19; 1 Cor. x. 20, 21; 2 Cor. vi. 14—17; Gal. iii. 4; Jas. v. 12; Ezek. xlv. 24.)

If Romans xiii. 9, and Ephesians vi. 2, be read together, the continuing obligation of the second table of the Decalogue is too plain to be denied. The Law of Mount Sinai, as this was the old law of nature, necessarily comprehended all that God ever demanded as the duty of man. "If there had been a law which could have given life, verily, righteousness should have been by the Law." (Gal. iii. 21.) "This do," said Jesus, "and thou shalt live." The same is implied by St. Paul. (Rom. xiv. 9.) The general principle laid down is, that Christ's people are dead with Him to

all that was abolished of the old covenant ; risen with Him, and subject under Him, to all that revived, and remained under the new covenant.

Although the *seventh-day* sabbath be gone, yet the *portion of man's life*, which was originally appointed for worship, or *sabbatizing*, "remains," in evangelical completeness, "to the people of God." (Heb. iv. 9.)

As "there is one God, one faith, one seed," or church, so there is substantially one worship, and one rule in all things. For how can there be one church without one faith ; one faith without one rule in worship, and all essential things ? A sabbath, therefore, for the worship of God must have been part of the old covenant law of nature, as well as the other moral duties of the Decalogue. And it might be just as well asserted, because the threatenings, promises, and prescriptions of the law are absorbed in gospel truth, that *their* essence is, therefore, abolished ; as that the sabbath, part of the Sinaitic covenant, and abrogated with the Mosaic institutions, in its relation to these, retains no moral obligation as a day of holy rest.

We are "dead to the law, and delivered from the law," by Jesus Christ. (Rom. vii. 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 22, 25.) Yet as "the law is spiritual," and "its commandment holy, just, and good," so spiritual persons "consent" to this goodness, &c., desire its attainment, "would do good ;" "delight in it after the inner man," and "serve it with their mind." In the same way, they are dead to the law of the old covenant through the law of the new.

The law is void to them only through the gospel, which fulfils it in Christ ; and so this "establishes the law." (Gal. ii. 19 ; Rom. viii. 2 ; vi. 14 ; 1 Cor. ix. 21 ;

1 Tim. i. 9 ; Rom. iii. 31.) And thus also they are dead to the original sabbatical law only as it was adapted to the institutions of Moses ; *i. e.*, as specifically restricted to the *seventh day* ; as to its legal rigours, (representative of perfection in this, as in all other things, and impossible to fallen man,) as their covenant sign ; and as preparing the way for transference of its principle to the new, free, and holy gospel rest. And hence we are “alive” to it in the new covenant “law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus,” whose “sabbatizing remains.”

It is said, indeed, “we are nowhere taught by Christ, or His apostles, that the Law on Mount Sinai included the whole of human duty.” (Mod. Sabb. Examined.) Again, “the Decalogue was designed exclusively for the Jewish nation.”

“Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter ; Fear God, and keep His commandments, for this is *the whole of man*.” (Eccles. xii. 13 ; Septuag., “all the man.”)

Here is the *result*, then, of all the lessons of wisdom comprised in the fear of God, and obedience to His commandments.

It will be said, doubtless, that we are not to restrict this to the commandments in the Decalogue.

Our Lord’s “two great commandments,” however, are unquestionably both a summary of what is prescribed in the Decalogue, and of all that the moral Law can demand as the duty of man. And it is not the duty of the Jew alone to love God with all the powers of the soul, and all his *strength*, and his neighbour as himself, but of every child of Adam. (Prov. viii. ; Mark xii. 28—34 ; Matt. v. 16 to the end ; 1 Cor. i. 24.) In

this respect the position of the Jew was common to all men.

But our Lord referred the substance of the *whole Scriptures* of the Old Testament to the principles embodied in that summary of human duty.

Why are the prescriptions of the Decalogue recited in the New Testament, if intended exclusively for the Jews?

It will be said the *fourth* is omitted. And why? Because it had an original precedence of all other duties, and remains as the fountain head of all duty. Because it had peculiarities which were to cease with an abrogation of Mosaic institutions. Because it had its ancient and peculiar pre-eminence in the *new*, as in the *old* creation; a peculiar distinction as “the body” of all the leading Jewish ordinances of worship; and, finally, because it had its appropriate place of *order* relatively to that work of which it is the holy rest, as at the beginning. Besides, an enunciation of this, in juxtaposition with the other commandments, might have been perverted into an occasion of doubt as to its original authority; as it has been perverted, through repetition in the Decalogue itself, into an opinion of its prescription for the first time at Sinai.

A great king resolved to build a magnificent palace. He furnished one of his architects with the design; and a *model* which was not only perfect as a *pattern of all things*, but sufficiently capacious to contain all those who were to be employed in carrying out the plan to completion, with the most precise instructions for the public and private government of the workmen employed.

One leading feature was to be carefully preserved

throughout the work ; viz., that this palace should retain every essential characteristic and property of a building which had preceded it, carefully marked in the plans and model, but which had been destroyed ; and that there should be such an exact transference of all things from the model to this new structure, and from the duties of the temporary to the permanent household, that the one should be the very *form* and *shadow*, the other, the very substance and perfected body.

One part, however, that which related to the code of domestic economy, and ecclesiastical government, the royal builder reserved to be specially carried out under His own personal directions. These were delivered, therefore, both verbally and in writing, by Himself, in the presence of all His servants engaged in the work, summoned together for that purpose, with the most solemn and public assertion of His own rights, and authority over the whole work, from beginning to end ; and over those who were to be considered as one household, but in different conditions and habitations. This he directed, as the very title-deed to the whole, to be deposited in the inmost recesses of the model, *close* to that repository where all the leading plans of the original structure were placed, but separated and distinct from all the rest. Before the palace was completed, an enemy ransacked the model, and carried away some of the regalia deposited *near* this sacred code. On the builders' restoration, however, the royal law remained safe and was preserved until the palace was finished, and the model taken down. (2 Chron. v. 10.)

On removal to the new palace the question arose whether or not, with all things new, a new code had not been established, *especially* as more freedom had been

introduced. This was strenuously resisted, because of the King's constant adherence to His original plan, His known aversion to all changes, and the special distinction paid to this household code, denominated the *Royal Law*; from obedience to which not one subject was excused in one point; besides the fact, that it was *not* a part of the model, had been carefully distinguished from it, and only deposited in it for the government of the household for the time being, and with an evident intimation of its transference to the household of the new palace of the Great King.

Some, however, contended that, notwithstanding all the marked care and distinction, this code *was* part of the model alone; intended only for its inmates; superseded and replaced by new statutes, suitable to the change of habitation by the King, and the greater liberty of His subjects. But it happened that the very proclamation which was to summon the household to their change of residence, sent by the last *messenger* of the King, had announced that there should not be any essential change whatever in this household law: "The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple." "*I am the Lord; I change not*: therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." (Mal. iii. 6.)

The builders had been most rebellious, and by *the royal law* merited destruction with the model. Their severe but mitigated punishment was held forth as a lesson to the new household both of the "goodness and severity" of the royal Builder. And the assurance was reiterated that every transgressor of "one point of the royal law" should "be held guilty of all."

The Old Testament cannot be discarded in any part, as our opponents desire, in an interpretation of the New.

Our Lord and His apostles always referred to it in confirmation of their statements. Jesus said of those scriptures, "they testify of Me." And without this evidence, how can we know the truth to which they bear witness? *The spirit* even of their predictions *is the* "testimony of Jesus." (Rev. xix. 10.)

These assertions as to moral law, the Decalogue and Old Testament, are easily made, but not to be repelled with the brevity which is to be desired.

It is equally bold and easy to say that "the former word of prophecy has received its verification and fulfilment in the advent and work of the Messiah." But this is only true in a limited sense. It has been fulfilled only so far as it related to them. The whole work of Jesus is predicted in the Old Testament. "All things are put under Him." "But now we see not yet all things put under Him." (Ps. ii., &c. &c. ; Dan. ii., vii., xi., xii. ; Rev. x. 7 ; Rom. viii. 20, 23 ; Heb. ii. 8, 9 ; Luke xvi. 16.) Its more glorious portions remain unfulfilled. He said upon the cross, "It is finished," whilst He had not yet risen, nor ascended, nor sent forth the Holy Ghost.

And He said, in like sense, "the law and the prophets were until John." He thus indicated the dividing point between Moses and Christ, in the predicted ministry and message of the Baptist. St. Peter directs the attention of Christians to prophecy, as "to a light shining in a dark place ;" and, therefore, in this darkness, partially unfilled, irradiating, but not removing the darkness of the future ; and where fulfilling it, "more sure" than the verification of Christ to the senses on the holy mount. One great object still remained, to "make known the power and coming of the Lord" in glory.

It would be needless digression to enter into a consideration of the nature and range of the conscience in relation to moral duty. But the double sense of the primitive term should be kept in view. "A man may be conscious as it respects himself as to his own counsel, and conscious also as to the designs of others, or their counsel: privy to a secret." (M. Placcet's *Christian Casuist*, p. 12.)

Certain it is that the term is applied to *the mind*, to *the whole soul*; to *sanction of evil* in a cessation of the action and the habit of doing what is good, especially in the case of *heretics*: and that conscience is expressed in Hebrew *by the heart*. (Rom. ii. 15; 1 John iii. 20; 1 Cor. ii. 11; Heb. ix. 14; Tit. i. 15; iii. 11.)

This natural light or law, then, extends only to natural things. It is an obscure knowledge of God, of one God; of "themselves," or of human nature, in relation to natural things; that is, of the worship of God, as all idolatry proves; that "the stock is a doctrine of vanities;" of leading natural relations, and certain consequent duties, the spring of social order and law; of natural affections; the natural appetites and duties discernible in the inevitable confusions and various evils consequent on their violation, and the necessary duty of moderation. But where *natural truth* touches the *spiritual verities* of *faith*, *hope*, and *charity*, and there must be this salient point, "there is not in the world," says Hooker, "a syllable muttered with certain truth concerning any of these things more than hath been supernaturally received from the mouth of the eternal God." (Eccl. Pol., Vol. I. p. 175.) Thus if it be the natural suggestion of the mind of man that God is to be worshipped, yet revelation must declare *how* this is to be

done "in spirit and in truth." Nor is this line of demarcation so readily discerned that we can assert, it is at the point where the superstructure rises from "the foundation." Thus the natural basis of marriage, and of woman's inferiority and subjection to man, everywhere known and acted upon, are the subjects of faith and revelation. And the doubts and crudities of the wisest heathens, aided even by light superior to that of the natural mind, attest awfully under what obscurity an unchangeable God holds man to moral responsibility; and leaves him without excuse, on personal grounds, at the same time. Thus Aristotle, the very man who had seen the works of Solomon, makes that "jesting and foolish talking" a virtue, which the Lord Jesus instructed His apostle to mark as a sin ! (Eph. v. 4.)

It appears, then, that man was left to his own mind,—to his natural conception of moral duty, only as a judicial punishment of sin. Every part of his duty was originally revealed. He has always possessed an outward guide in God's revelation, and an internal teacher in God's Holy Spirit. This knowledge was transmitted, orally and otherwise, but not without occasional and supernatural reviviscency among the chosen depositaries of truth perhaps even among others ; until, in the mass of the human race, the dim conceptions of the law of nature only remained ; deepened everywhere into the dark gloom of the shadow of death ; and judicially overwhelmed by sense and sin.

Noah was "the eighth preacher of righteousness," (2 Peter ii. 5) in the favoured line. But sin prevailed, and destroyed the old world. In Noah's day, therefore, God graciously began, in a series of providential arrangements, through Shem the progenitor of Abraham, to

provide means of an imperishable record of human duty in the law. But, the very first step, in the passover sacrifice and feast of unleavened bread and Pentecost, was to lay the foundation of his rest, so that it should be inevitably secured even to the last days of the church, as we shall prove. And, then, before any introduction of other legal shadows of the gospel, the next step was to revive the old creation sabbath at Sin. Subsequent promulgation of it from the holy mount, on the original basis, as the covenant sign and means of His people's sanctification, could not, therefore, by dissolution, or temporary suspension of any part of this covenant, affect in any way His original appointment, significantly perpetuated, on its ancient basis, at Sin, and Sinai as well.

I can now proceed to the Mosaic prescription on the holy mount.

“Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God : in it thou shalt not do any work ; thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day ; wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.” (Exod. xx. 8, 9, 10, 11.)

A careful perusal of this commandment will shew that *the holy day* prescribed is *the seventh*, on whatever precise day of the week this might fall. Nor, as observed before, can it be known now which of the seven days this was ; were it even known on what precise day of the week it was observed at Sin. (Josh. x. 13.)

Two things are plainly comprised in this introduction to the Decalogue: "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."

First, there is the *Nature of God*, into which each command must be resolved; and *second*, there is *His relation to Israel*, as their covenant God, and redeemer out of the bondage of Egypt.

These two points relate to the primary foundation of human duty, and to that special occasion when this was made the basis upon which the prescriptions in the Decalogue were laid. And these leading principles entered originally into the moral duty of man towards God, the creator of his moral and spiritual perfection after His own image, and the preserver both of body and soul.

And they still remain as the foundation of human duty, which arises in the nature of God, and our covenant relations to Him in Christ, the arm of the Lord; our Deliverer out of the bondage of sin into "the glorious liberty of the children of God." (Rom. xii. 1.) And upon this same ground we find the solemn introduction to the delivery of His will repeated. (Lev. xviii. 1—4; xix. 2, &c.)

The principle, therefore, on which each commandment rests is *the nature of God*, and *His peculiar relation to Israel His people*: first, after the flesh; second, after the Spirit. Jesus, therefore, resolves the *whole* into the nature and perfections of God. The communication of this nature to the soul of man by the Holy Spirit ensures a fulfilment of his duty to God and his neighbour. The image and likeness of God in the soul of Adam found its natural expression, doubtless, by the

Spirit, "in righteousness and true holiness," until he transgressed.

In His own essence God is ever the same ; and His commandments, therefore, are unchangeable in their essential nature and obligation. The *fourth* commandment involves the common principle, consequently, of moral, divine, and perpetual obligation, independent of that which may vary with any variation of the peculiar covenant, and its sign between God and Israel His chosen, as the priesthood did in its relation to that people. (N.B. Heb. viii. 9.)

The form of prescribing the Sabbath, therefore, is conformable to His special covenant relation with Israel ; viz., "*the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God.*" But the terms of the *original* appointment, recited before this in the command, are of a *general* nature, and correspondent in the law of nature to the liberty of *sabbatizing* under the gospel. Repetition, in the fourth commandment, of the prefix to the Decalogue is *distinctive* ; as the sabbath was the covenant sign, and indicated the grand end and result of the covenant itself, viz., an everlasting rest in and with the Lord.

The narrative in Genesis is at variance with a *recent* appointment at Sinai, not being in present time. The general reason which is formally assigned in the Decalogue for prescription of this ordinance is neither expressed in present time, nor is the covenant relation to Israel named in it : "wherefore *the Lord blessed*,"—not *blesses*,—"the sabbath day,"—not the *seventh day*—"and hallowed it ;" *i. e.*, the sabbath, at the beginning. (Exo. xvi.)

Dr. Owen observes, "Any other day would have been

a sanctification of the same portion of time ; but it would not have carried with it the reason of the original appointment, which was not merely that it should be such a rest as God's, but a rest with God, and because of God's. And, it may be added, it was also such a rest of the federal Head in and with God as imposed an immutable obligation on all His seed : the Creator and His law remaining precisely the same.

The commandment is in the *future* ; and implies not a single day's observance merely, but the sanctification of each recurring seventh day in all future time.

In hallowing *the seventh day* as the sabbath, two things are necessarily involved ; viz., the portion of time to be dedicated to this holy rest out of seven such portions ; and that particular portion of the seven which *Israel* should maintain. For if they had observed the *sixth*, or any other than the *seventh* day, the commandment would have been violated ; whilst the prescribed portion of time was maintained. What, if any change occurred, as through the miracle in Joshua's day, still this was under the directing providence and will of the Author of this institution. There is all the difference between sanctification of a *seventh part of time* because of God's rest in it, and because it was *the seventh day* ; which is the mere *accident*, not the reason and principle of the prescription. The commandment prescribes both the original *portion* separated, and the *seventh day* as that portion for holy rest. It enacts both the principle of the duty, and the order of time wherein it is to fulfilled by God's chosen people. The great point urged is, that each individual in the congregation, or visible church—

those whom God audibly addressed as a body—should *remember* to sanctify not the *seventh day*, but *the sabbath*; and with this the prescription both begins and terminates.

It has been shown before that the fourth commandment comprises that which is both *moral* and *positive* in its ordination. “The Modern Sabbath Examined” denominates this, indeed, “a contradiction in terms.” (Vide Introd., p. 3.) However, Hooker says, “there are positive laws in all the four descriptions of law.” (Eccl. Pol., Vol. I., p. 185.) It enforces a duty of perpetual obligation upon man, by a reason which was imperative, “for the time being,” only on the Jew. It must be shown, however, that the *duty* of worship, and the *time* to be devoted to this worship, are separable from each other in a prescription which applies to the church as a body. A duty definite in its *nature*, but indefinite as to the time, must necessarily lead to a contradictory practice, and the certain and destructive results of division.

It is easy to denominate it “an extraordinary dogma—to assert that one portion of time is more holy than another.” “That it is a gross fallacy to represent the law, ‘Thou shalt not steal,’ and an injunction to sanctify a determinate portion of time, as laws alike immutable in their obligation. The former is a moral duty, being founded in the nature of things, and its obligation is recognized by the human conscience, independent of any specific enactment.” (Mod. Sabb. Exam.)

These are *assertions*, and might be fairly met with a *simple denial*. But the doctrine of the Sabbath is incorrectly stated. This is truly and in effect, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, by devoting to this work a

seventh portion of thy whole life." It includes the worship of God as He is, in our relation to Him as our covenant God, and in the devotion to His worship of the determinate time assigned to it by His will. And thus "the day and night" entered into His natural covenant, which prescribed a devotion of six days to work, and one to worship and rest.

It is the presence of God's truth and will, of God Himself in fact, through the manifestation of His nature and sovereignty in the command, as real as when He delivered His commandments in the holy mount, and implicated by their audible promulgation there, that impart to them a moral nature. His special severance of places or persons to His own service and glory constitutes them in a certain sense holy; *i.e.*, in their *separation* to exclusive and holy uses, and in a spiritual, rational devotion of man to the services required. When He denominates the Sabbath "My holy day," then, there is equal morality involved in its observance, and in a regard to the command which assigns the right of property to each human being in prohibiting its unauthorized appropriation by another. The morality attaches not to the *property*, strictly speaking, but to God's *presence* in the law which represents His will, and to man's duty to obey. And so it is not, in strict sense, "the day" as "a part of time," but of a prescribed portion of the life of *man* in which a duty to God is to be performed.

There are two things involved in each commandment, *viz.*, the *principle* and the *mode* in which it is to be carried out in practice. Thus it is in the commandments in question. The prescription, "Thou shalt not steal," evidently implies a corporeal act, as the mode of

violating the command ; or, spiritually, the *desire* of appropriating what is another's to our use.

And so, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God," is the *moral duty* ; "Thou shalt sanctify the seventh day to this worship," is the *form and mode*, or, the *positive* part of the prescription. And, would not disobedience to either of these be an equally sinful act against God as transgression of any other command in the Decalogue ?

We do not attach a literal holiness *to time* or *to place*, or inanimate things, except in relation to that *separation* which is its invariable adjunct ; and to that *obedience* to the prescription of God, which ordains the separation. "The place whereon thou standest is holy ground ;" "the most holy place," as applied to the temple within the veil : "every devoted thing is most holy to the Lord : " (Lev. xxvii. 28,) are open with as much reason as the Sabbath, sanctified each seventh day, to such observations. The *ground*, and *building*, and *vessels* of the temple, what were these but inanimate matter in themselves ? The *presence* of God ; the command and will of God, relatively to their estimation and employment by man ; these are the things in which we must look for the moral principles involved. "Thy Name is in this house," said Jehoshaphat, in his beautiful prayer to the God of Israel for help ! That house, the type and shadow of His body, of whom Moses said, "My Name is in Him." (Exod. xxiii. 21.) Nor does any body mean any other thing. The "dogmatism,—the gross fallacy," if there be any, is not ours. Holiness is a living principle and habit formed by God's Spirit in man ; flowing out of the nature, and leading into the living image, of the Lord ; in the actings of the soul, and the whole walk and conversation of the believer.

We may speak, with all propriety surely, of the holiness of a man's *life*, or time appointed of God, or, specially, of a *certain portion* of his life, from its exclusive occupation in holy employments ; or of the recurring seventh day, through all his days, sanctified as the sabbath by the presence of God ; by his hearing him in His word ; by speaking to Him, in making known his wants, with supplication and prayer, and by holy fellowship through the Spirit. It is not, then, *our* absurdity to ascribe literal holiness to a mere abstraction—to part of an efflux of duration.

CHAPTER VI.

TWO OF THE OLD TESTAMENT PREDICTIONS OF A DAY OF HOLY REST UNDER THE GOSPEL DISPEN- SATION EXAMINED.

I AM not aware that these have been scrutinized with the care which they deserve. It has been, indeed, with some surprise that I have seen how very slight a notice has been deemed satisfactory as to those arguments on which the moral and divine obligation of the Lord's day is reposed. This is specially the case as to those which have been selected from the New Testament ; and particularly the very elaborate and conclusive arguments of Owen on the Hebrews. (Vol. II., sec. 4.) Bold and unsupported assertions in upholding opposite views are not less remarkable than painful, and show the power of prejudice on even the strongest minds, generally candid and open.

The two passages to which I would direct attention are taken one from the Psalms, and the other from the last chapter of Isaiah.

Other proofs from the Psalms and Prophets may be seen in Bishop Wilson's Seven Sermons (Serm. iii. and iv.) ; who notices also, but briefly, the places to which I would direct attention. No candid reader, surely, could mistake the passage in the 56th chapter of Isaiah. "The sons of the stranger," and the "others besides Israel" (4—8), that were to be gathered, evidently point to the Gentiles, and among these a sabbath was to be observed.

"*This is the Lord's doing*" (marg. "from the Lord") : "*it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day the Lord hath made : we will rejoice, and be glad in it.*" (Ps. cxviii. 22—24.)

It is impossible to assent to Burnside's assertion, that it is uncertain *what day* is referred to in that Psalm. (Chap. vii. p. 190.) It is very plainly *the resurrection*, and not *the ascension* day of Christ, which is intended.

Much less is it to be conceded that it is a day relating *personally* to the Psalmist alone. In this sense the relation is so general and temporary, if there be any, that no special work or day can be now ascertained with any certainty of correspondence.

Nor would this be a very intelligible or likely way for any individual to relate his own private experience. It is unlikely, indeed, in that case that knowledge of the work and of the day would have been obliterated altogether. Application of this kind must only be to such a general and temporary purpose as almost any passage in the Book might be accommodated then, or indeed now, in a believer's humiliation or exaltation in providence or grace, in common with the Messiah.

The *Ascension* is the special subject of the 24th Psalm ;

in which the warfare and triumph of the Messiah are not named, as here, in any special connection with the *day itself*; but with the majesty and glory of the conqueror; the assurance of His people in this triumphant ascension, and His glorious session at the right hand of God: "His God and their God, His Father and their Father." "Where He is, there also will His servants be." (John xii. 26; Ps. xxiv.)

Let the context be examined with care. "I called on the Lord in distress: the Lord answered me, and set me in a large place." (Verses 5, 6.)

Can any hesitation exist as to an application of this? The Evangelist supplies the very words in which this call of distress found an utterance. It is the closing scene on calvary: His victory over the power of the grave, the exaltation of His name, and extension of His church in "a large place," *i.e.*, among the Gentiles. (Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34; Luke xxiii. 46; John xix. 30.) These topics are briefly followed out in language which, from its application elsewhere, verifies this interpretation. "All nations compassed me about," &c. (Ps. cxviii. 11—13.) "Of a truth," said the apostles, "against Thy holy child Jesus, whom Thou hast annointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together." (Ps. ii. 1, 2; Acts iv. 24—28.) And is it not plain that the sacrifice of Christ to their malice was the purpose for which "they thrust sore?"

"The voice of rejoicing and salvation" (Ps. cxviii. 15), however, was mingled with the savage cry, "Away with Him;" whilst these sinners were doing, "whatever God's hand and counsel determined before to be done." (Acts iv. 28.)

His faith and assurance, therefore, triumphed in the very depths of the distress from whence He cried, "I shall not die, but live, and declare the works of the Lord." (Ps. cxviii. 5, 17.) And He did live, and "declare the works of the Lord" in His new creation; finished in this day of the Lord, "by His resurrection from the dead," and in this work and day "we rejoice, and are glad." (Rom. i. 4.)

The inspired writer proceeds to declare, further, the entrance of this Conqueror into *the city of righteousness*, "the heavenly Jerusalem," as the forerunner of His people, in language that accords with the magnificent prediction of His jubilant ascension, in the 24th Psalm. (Heb. xii. 22, 23; Is. xxv. 6—12; xxvi. 1, 2.) And all the righteous, in the meanwhile, "risen together with Him" out of the grave of original sin and corruption, celebrate in "rejoicing and gladness," the natal day of their Head, on His entrance into rest, and His completion of this "marvellous work of the Lord." *This* is the ground of praise—God's answer to the cry of distress—perfecting the work of redemption—and securing refuge in "a strong city, where God hath appointed salvation for walls and bulwarks."

This event was the last stroke of the Builder to the "tried stone and precious corner-stone, laid in Zion; and which the Jews rejected." (Is. xxviii. 16; Ps. cxviii. 22, 24.)

And from this day the full tide of "prosperity" began to "flow from under the threshold," and "blessing out of the house of the Lord," as a healing stream of life "among all nations." (Verses 25, 26; Ezek. xlvi. 1—5.)

The Psalmist mentions two characteristics of this

work ; and these confirm the relation of the prediction to Jesus, and His day of rest.

First, the completion of the Lord's work ; and in this a display of marvellous operation, both attesting it to be *His*, and "marvellous" as the doing even of Jehovah.

Second, a peculiar connection of this day, as the day *made by the Lord*, with a season of holy rejoicing and gladness in it by the church. There cannot be any doubt that the resurrection of Jesus was the completion of what the Psalmist calls "the works of the Lord" (Ps. cxviii. 17 ; Heb. iii. 1—6), and St. Paul "the house of Jesus Christ." St. Peter refers the completion of the new creation to the resurrection of Christ ; and this as foretold in this very Psalm. (Acts iv. 10, 11.) And the apostle Paul, quoting another Psalm, attaches the proof of Christ's Sonship, and therefore of His presidency "over His own house," to the same event. (Ps. ii. 7 ; Acts xiii. 32—35 ; Heb. iii. 6.) The prophet Isaiah unites, in the same way, its beginning when the foundation was laid with its completion when the stone was deposited which "became the Head of the corner" by the resurrection of Christ. The language in which He describes Messiah's triumph over all opposition is most striking : "Your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand." (Is. xxviii. 16—21.) And why ? Because, says the Psalmist in one place, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell," &c. And in another, "I shall not die, but live, and declare," &c. Let the 16th verse in the *prophet* be read connectedly with the *gospel* narratives of the demoniacal exultation of the Jews when they believed their triumph assured in the death of Jesus !

To this event they looked, as the advocates of a bad cause have ever done, to violence, when overpowered by truth and reason, for the suppression of His religion. Whilst reading those simple and affecting narratives, it seems as if the prophet had actually witnessed all, and heard all, in vision with open eyes and ears! The furious looks and gestures of exulting wickedness! The taunting mockery of "The King of glory!" The malicious fiends of darkness gathered around the cross, as eagles at their prey! The ministering host of heaven withdrawn, to leave the Sufferer alone with the sin of the world upon His head! Nay, the very cry of Jesus, "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit!" And then looking upon the pale and mangled body of the Man of sorrows suspended on the accursed tree, he exclaims to them in this their hour of imaginary triumph, "*Your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand!*"

The Saviour Himself pointed to this psalm as predicting His rejection by the Jews, terminating in the death of the Householder's Son; and consummated in His resurrection when the Stone was deposited in its prepared place, and the temple destroyed by them rebuilt "by the Spirit of holiness" "in three days." (Matt. xxi. 42, 43; John ii. 19.)

In this event God proclaimed the remission of sin to all that believe, by removal of its imputed penalty from their Head, and the perfection of the house of the Lord. He is, therefore, "declared" (*margin*, "determined") "to be the Son of God, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." (Rom. i. 4; Ps. ii. 7; Acts xiii. 33.) The proposition implies a strict *conformity* to the holiness of God, in this

deliverance of His Son from the power of the grave.

By this, His victory over sin was assured to man as complete. Nor was it complete until this glorious triumph was achieved ; for death is the penalty of sin. "If Christ be not raised," says St. Paul, "ye are yet in your sins." (1 Cor. xv. 17.) This finished work, then, constituted the Stone, rejected by the Jewish "builders," "the Head of the corner."

It may be said, indeed, that the eminence of the day of resurrection is not denied, but that this *alone* does not constitute it a day of holy rest. However, the completed work of Christ, and His instant entrance into His rest, impart to it the peculiar features characteristic of the Sabbath at its original and evangelical institution. And was not this prefigured by "the feast of new moons" being prescribed on the first day of the appearance of the new moon ? Added to this are the remarkable facts asserted by the Psalmist, that "this is *the day* which *the Lord* hath made ; and in which His people rejoice, and are glad." It is not a result restricted to the Psalmist, commemorative alone of some great, personal deliverance ; but a subject of common and spiritual rejoicing and gladness to him, and to all the people of God. The change from the first person singular to the plural, like St. Paul's expression of "we," indicates an interest in it of the whole church. Besides, "the day which *the Lord* hath made," as He made "the sabbath for the man," the predicted day, and "the Lord's day" of St. John, are too remarkable in identity of expression, and peculiarity of application, either to pass unnoticed, or to be confounded with a day in ordinary phraseology made by God for the common uses of life.

From the fifth to the fourteenth verse the Psalmist speaks in the person of the Messiah as approaching to the painful termination of His mission. In the next two verses glory is ascribed to Him as "the right hand of the Lord," and to His valiant deeds. In the seventeenth the prophet foretels the testimony to be borne by Him "that liveth, and was dead" to the completion of "the works of the Lord." His deliverance from death is celebrated in the eighteenth. In the nineteenth the gates of the new temple are commanded to be thrown open. His own entrance with the congregation of the righteous is authoritatively proclaimed. The head stone of the corner is then declared to be laid, and He and all the "lively stones" of the spiritual building together celebrate the rest day of the second man, saying, "this is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it ;" or, "*this is the Lord's day.*"

Peculiar circumstances invested the day of resurrection with a pre-eminent glory, and identified it with the "marvellous doing of the Lord" foretold in the Psalm.

Upon the event of this day the whole truth of God and the salvation of man were suspended. Jesus both raised the dead and empowered His apostles to do the same. But this event accredited His own mission, and the testimony of His apostles to the completion of the work of redeeming love, and the certain admission of all His people to the presence of God and to a participation of His glory (Acts i. 22 ; ii. 24, &c.) It was, therefore, the subject of special predictions, and shadowed forth in legal types. The most wonderful fact, however, is that the resurrection was His own act. He raised *Himself* from the dead ; He foretold it : He specified

the precise time when it should be done. Such a thing was never heard before or since, nor ever will be heard again ; and all that was predicted of it and depended upon it was ratified by the seal of the God of all truth. (Matt. xxvii. 63 ; John ii. 19.)

It is to be observed also that after the terms in which this *work* is magnified, *the day* of its completion is exalted both in itself, as appointed and foretold of God, and in this sacred employment of it in the church by His ordination. The night of Israel's deliverance from bondage was "a night to be much observed unto the Lord." (Exod. xii. 42.) But there is not any day thus marked in the *ascension* of our Lord, nor in *any event* which does not stand connected with the Sabbath. We find it paralleled at the creation ; at Sin, on the occasion of God's feeding His people with the bread of heaven in double measure ; at the gift of "the bread of God which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world" (John vi. 33.) ; here, in a prediction of the real deliverance of the captives of sin ; at Sinai, when His house or church, as a type of the new and spiritual creation, received its peculiarity of administration under the old creation law and Sabbath of God.

This day, then, was evidently "made for the man, the second man" Christ Jesus, and for the rejoicing and *gladness* of His church ; analogous to that which God denominated "a delight, the holy of the Lord, and honourable" in the estimation, observance, and experience of His people. "We rejoice and are glad," not *for* it alone, but "*in*" it. Nor is it *a* day simply, but "*the* day" which the Lord hath made, and for that object to which it was to be appropriated by the church.

In this, as of old, they were to "honour Him, not doing their own ways, not finding their own pleasure, nor speaking their own words." (Gen. ii. 2, 3 ; viii. 21. *margin* ; Numb. x. 35, 36 ; Ps. cxxxii. 8, 9 ; cxviii. 22 ; Owen on Heb. Vol. iv. 290 ; Is. lviii. 13.) And in this description of Sabbatical duties can it be contended for a moment that moral principles are not involved ? And as God had appointed to Israel a day of holy rest ; as this newly created day of *rejoicing* and *gladness* decreed on the completion of the marvellous work of Jehovah depositing the stone rejected by rebellious and murderous builders in its place, and election of a nation bringing forth the fruits of righteousness ; so, this prediction is tantamount to a *transference* of the old day of spiritual delight in its establishment on the corner stone of the liberty of man. (Job xxxviii. 7.)

It would not be any sufficient answer to say that *day* has often in the Scriptures a more extended meaning : "in His day shall the righteous flourish ;" "your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day." In Mant's note on Easter-day, it is said, "The Fathers unanimously expound that passage of this day (the birth-day of our Saviour in His state of glory and exaltation), and therefore with them, as with us, the Psalm was always part of the office of the day." (Prayer Book.) The more limited sense as applicable to the very day of rest in question, or as inclusive of it, may be taken in the passages just cited. And this is especially true in respect of Abraham, when receiving Isaac again as from the dead, "on the third day," and saying, "in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen." The first passage, too, may be well applied to the gospel rest, blessed of God in the birth, spiritual growth, and prosperity

of His people. But *this* is *one day* characterized by what may be called the *inseparable sabbatical facts* of a completed work and instantaneous rest. It is identified with the gospel Sabbath, and no other day. It is also a day recurring in all future time, for it embraces the whole church of Christ.

The other passage proposed for consideration is even more decisive than that from the Psalm. (Is. lxvi. 23.) The authorized version reads thus :—"And it shall come to pass from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another shall *all flesh come to worship before me*, saith the Lord." In the bibles called Taverner's, and in Bishop Cranmer's,* the passage is rendered as follows :—"There shall be a new moon for the other, *and all flesh shall come to worship before me*, sayeth the Lord." "There shall be a new moon for ye other, and a new Sabbath for ye other, and *all flesh shall come to worshyppe before me*, sayeth the Lord."

These versions were sent to the "Record" newspaper some years ago (I have not the date), under the signature "*John Calvin*."

Literal reading of the Hebrew :—"And it shall come to pass, or, it shall be, the *measure* of a *new moon* from its *new moon*, and the *measure* of a *Sabbath* from its *Sabbath*, *all flesh shall come to worship before me*, saith Jehovah."

The passage, as last rendered, appears to intimate that the general *rule, proportion, or analogy*, between church and church, and between sabbath and sabbath, shall be sustained among all nations in their worship of the Lord. And this implies, as to the day of rest, a common

* A.D. 1549.

portion of time sacred to worship ; and a common analogy of faith, and observance in the Mosaic and Gentile churches. It is evident, on the very face of the passage in our authorized version, that it relates to the worship of God ; to a divinely instituted day of holy rest among the Gentiles. These are palpable and leading features, and in my opinion, beyond all reasonable contradiction. However, let the whole bearing of the context in the chapter be carefully examined.

The preceding context in the last chapter relates to the gospel church in its final condition upon earth. (lxxv. 25.) In the first verse of this chapter the prophet asks a remarkable question. “ Thus saith the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool : where is the *house* that ye build unto me ? and where is the *place of my rest* ? ” This foretels, evidently, a change in the Mosaic system, in which the house or church, the special presence and Sabbath of God, were confined to one place and people. The question implies an approaching time when these peculiarities in God’s worship were to cease ! And when the canopy of the whole heaven alone should comprehend the boundaries of His church. This is the leading subject of the chapter.

Its next prominent feature is a double address of the prophet, directed to two classes of persons throughout, viz, the true church and habitation of God through the Spirit ; specially to the professing Israel of the Lord, their unbelieving, infidel, and sanctimonious brethren, who despised the hope of Israel, and hated those by whom it was entertained, saying, “ Let the Lord be glorified.” (2, 3, 4, 5, 17, 18. Ezek. xxxiv. 19—31.) He deals appropriately with both throughout the chapter.

To the one, the most glorious promises are given ; extending, as usual in the prophecies of the Old Testament, to “the day approaching” when Israel’s greatest deliverance would be wrought. The call of the Gentiles is foretold. (Verses 12, 18, 19.)

The ordination of new church institutions, and appointment of a new Sabbath among all flesh for the worship of God, is promised. (21—23.) The instrumentality of the Gentiles in Israel’s conversion and return to their own land is predicted, and their participation in the joy and enlargement of God’s ancient people. (8, 13, 20, Rev. xii.)

God’s heaviest judgments are denounced on the other class. Judicial blindness for their hypocritical formality, and obstinate presumption. (3, 4, 17, 18.) Their supercession as God’s peculiar people. The destruction of their city, temple, and church institutions. And their ultimate dispersion among all nations, as an imperishable monument of “the goodness, and severity of God.” (6, 15, 16—18, 22.)

Whilst the prophet predicts an establishment of new church institutions, and of a new Sabbath among the Gentiles, he marks this transition in administrative forms, and transference of the Sabbath ; as securing in all things the primitive rule, *or measure*, in them both. (21, 22.)

It will hardly be disputed that *the moon* is emblematical of the church, as reflective of the light of “the Sun of righteousness.” And a most significant emblem it is ; the moon, being, like the church, a light to the world in its season of darkness. And hence originated the Mosaic *feasts of new moon* ; which figure the prophet here adopts. And it appears to be in natural connection with

the foregoing verse, that she should be thus described. (Cant. vi. 10 ; Gen. xxxvii. 9, 10.) The whole framework of the new church is represented as a new creation of God. The superiority of this regenerated church-state over that of Moses is most magnificently described in Revelations. She is exhibited there as arrayed with "the Sun of righteousness" like a robe ; pre-eminent above all the splendours of the Mosaic, or natural firmament in glory. Her light is not the borrowed lustre merely of the moon, but she is clothed with the bright luminary of day itself, which fills all the lesser fires of heaven with light and glory. The prediction of the prophet Isaiah is accomplished by this glorious transformation into a new state ; "moreover the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days." (Isa. xxx. 26.) "Clothed with the sun," says the evangelical prophet, "having the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." (Rev. xii. 1.)

Now, as the change in this heavenly luminary is reckoned from its first appearance as new, so was the Mosaic church *new* relatively to the Patriarchal, or natural church ; and the gospel church *new* relatively to that of Moses. And the transition from one church to another is marked by this allusion to their first institution ; of the one under Moses, of the other under Jesus Christ. These churches are both *new* as to dispensation, and *old*, or the same, in essential unity of the truth, as the moon at the change is another, and yet the same.

This, again, confirms the view taken of the resurrection as the *actual* rising of the gospel church, in a

manifestation of the "mystery hidden from ages and generations."

The more these points are considered, the more apparent, I think, it will be, that the conclusion is very different both in fairness and strength to that so confidently reposed on the *mere mention* of the word Sabbath, relatively to a period when the Mosaic system had not been actually removed.

Nor is this to be refuted by confident assertion that "the first day Christians must look solely to the New Testament for its obligation." To this both Burnside and "The Modern Sabbath Examined" would restrict our proofs. But the converse of the proposition is true that "they without us would not be perfect."

Their doctrine of the Sabbath would be imperfect without ours; as part of a system of shadows, and which without the body would be shadows indeed. The same truth holds of the Mosaic and Patriarchal Churches, which are one with us. This conjoins the worship under the three forms of administration, as one in principle; maintaining in the whole church one character, in all its diverse modes of fulfilment, of immutability in the truth and worship of God.

The two Testaments are not like an algebraic equation, where one side may be made equal to nothing; but like the two tables of the law, where one cannot be observed without the other; and both united constitute the whole substance of the truth of God. Or, as an old writer observes, "they are like the Patriarch's ladder; its foot may be on earth, but it rises gradually through the several stages of the elementary and celestial worlds, through the moral and ecclesiastical states, till its head be triumphantly lost in heaven."

CHAPTER VII.

THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT OF THE DUTY OF KEEPING THE LORD'S DAY AS A HOLY REST.

IF a day of holy rest were part of the law of nature, which appears beyond all reasonable dispute ; and if the Psalmist ascribed an eminence, headship, and joyful sanctity to the day of Christ's resurrection, by God's special ordination to the church ; and if the prophet declared His decree of a *new sabbath*, in the new church state of "the glory which excelleth," among the Gentiles :—then we might naturally expect the statements of the New Testament to be rather inferential, than formally prescriptive, of a day of holy rest. In the same way we find that even fundamental doctrines, and others little or not at all questioned, are not always promulgated with the formality of the Decalogue. Such are the doctrines of the Holy Trinity—the co-eternity of the Son of God with the Father—the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and from the Son—

and the baptism of infants, &c. These are admitted, generally, without dispute.

The talented author of "The Modern Sabbath Examined," indeed, can "see no more correspondence between our two Sacraments, *as they are called*, (the italics are mine,) and the rites of Circumcision and the Passover, than in the prescription of time, separated on moral and religious grounds, to church worship, in the different forms of church administration."

If an error as to *the day of rest* may be presumed because of a fallacious opinion commonly entertained of the *sacraments*, then, if we be right as to these, this author must be wrong, on his own principle, as to the other. But such a conclusion is inconsequential altogether. Does it follow, because a man is wrong in one respect, that he is in error also on another, and independent doctrine?

St. Paul says, that "Christ was a minister of circumcision to confirm the truth of the promises made to the fathers;" *i.e.*, to identify the church of Moses as essentially one with the gospel church, through their ordinances of initiation. Or, to prove the *promises* to have been divine by a divine *ordinance*, ministered by Him who made both Jews and Gentiles one. And that He is, in the same sense, a minister of baptism to confirm to the seed of Abraham the promises made to the Gentiles, in him through whom all the families of the earth were to be blessed, seems also to follow. For, "they were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea;" or, to him who was the type of Christ. And, "we are all circumcised in Christ with the circumcision made without hands." These ordinances of initiation are, therefore, the two links which reciprocally

unite "the fathers," both with Jew and Gentile, in the common truth. "The promises" made to the one, rested in by faith, "confirm" the truth of God to the other, as the one foundation on which both are built, as one house; Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone. "The thing signified," therefore, is common to the whole body; *i.e.*, the regeneration of every child of the second man by His "quickening Spirit," (1 Cor. xv.,) separating him from the old Adam, uniting him by faith to "the Lord from heaven," and making him "partaker of the divine nature" of the new covenant Head. (2 Pet. i. 4.)

Men do, and will, run into one of the two extremes, which would make the sign everything in one case, or, nothing in the other. Each of these classes must pervert the nature and design of the ordinance. Each party has had its advocates among the Jews, and ourselves. The real benefit is to be looked for at the proper time, and in the appointed way: not exclusively at an administration of the initiatory rite; but throughout the whole state of salvation. Nor is it in virtue of any *opus operatum* of the ordinance, but by a renewal in the inner man, "day by day," through repentance and faith in the promise of the Spirit, visibly *signed* and *sealed* by baptism, as a spring of life never ceasing to flow. An old and learned author well observes, "The outward baptism, without the inward, is not the mark of God's child, but the mark of a fool, that makes a vow, and afterwards breaks it." (Eccles. v. 4; Perkins, Fol. Ed., Vol. II., p. 256; see Bishop Wilson's Seven Sermons.)

As to the other sacrament,—the time of its institution, at the same table, the celebration of the one running, as as it were, into the institution of the other,—the name

assigned to it by Jesus, "with desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer," (Matt. xxvi. 1—50,) and both were eaten at one time;—the object of the ordinance, "to show the Lord's death," (1 Cor. v. 7,)—the name of it transferred to the ordinance by an apostle, (Luke xxii. 16,) all corresponded, and are sufficient proofs, without insisting on others. "*Secundùm 'Buxtorf. Exercit. de Saer. Cænæ ritu,' duæ tantùm fuerunt Cænæ: una Agni Paschalis, altera Cænæ S. Novæ a Xto instituta, ita tamen et continuo ei et quasi uno actu, mensis non sublatis, subjuncta fuerit.*"—(*Cæna Xti Hackspan, p. 116.*)—"According to '*Buxtorf's Exercises on the Sacred Ordinance of the Supper,*' there have been only two Suppers: one of the Paschal Lamb, the other of the new, sacred Supper instituted by Christ; yet so that it has been subjoined to that, both immediately, and, as it were, by one act, the tables not having been removed."

This view is remarkably corroborated by the evangelists: "As they did eat Jesus took bread." (Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22.) In Luke, the institution begins with the Passover cup: the Jewish ordinance is completed; and it is instantly followed by its correspondent gospel institution. The one merges beautifully and silently into the other at one table, and without any remove. And we find the same characteristic, masterly hand of the perfect workman in the transition from the Law—its primary and distinctive feasts—in their quiet transference to the Gospel and "the Lord's day" of the new Dispensation.

But I return from this digression. If a passage so plain as that in Genesis have been so perverted with such contempt of adverse opinions, it is no wonder that

the difficulties in the way of opponents presented by the Epistle to the Hebrews have been passed almost without regard.

If any person will consult the learned and judicious Owen's Commentary on that part of this Epistle which relates to our holy rest, and compare the mass of evidence, learning, and solid argument accumulated there,—not to mention those admirable sermons of the Bishop of Calcutta on this subject, and passed unnoticed, as far as I can find,—with the brief, inadequate, and, I must say, meagre replies, he will wonder at the spirit and terms in which any man could speak of opponents who coincide with Owen, as entertaining “an extraordinary dogma, a gross fallacy, and perfectly preposterous notion.” But that good and able man is not to be whistled down the wind as a feather. (Vols. II. and IV.)

In general character the four Gospels and Epistle to the Hebrews appear to be to the New Testament what the Pentateuch is to the Old Testament. In those and the Epistles, with the books of the Acts and Revelation ; we possess details of the foundation, primitive and predicted history, and doctrinal testimony of the Church of Christ. So far there may be a general resemblance between the plans of the two books.

In his Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apostle traces the analogy between the old and new Creations ; and the analogy, and unity of the Church in its first, intermediate, and perfect administrations ; and especially between those of Moses and Christ.

His first care is to accredit the *whole* Scriptures as alike the will of God : one, indivisible, and complete. (Heb. i. 1.) If our holy rest, then, form part of the Apostle's argument, the connection of the Old Testament

with it, is as plainly implied as with the other subjects of this Epistle.

He then ascribes to the Lord Jesus Christ His proper eminence and dignity in both Creations, as One with the Father ; their Author, Head, and King ; born a King, heir of all things ; having all “power in heaven and in earth.” (Heb. i.)

To show the relation of the *Adamic* to the *Mosaic* and *Gospel* Churches, he points to the restoration of man’s forfeited dominion in “the second man,” and Head of the new World. This is, indeed, the leading subject of his Epistle. (1 Cor. xv ; Heb. ii ; Rev. xx. xxi. xxii.)

A brief, but decisive comparison is instituted between Moses and Christ ; and pre-eminence assigned to Jesus, as the Son and heir of the Father ; an eternal High Priest in His own house ; and not like Moses, a servant in another’s, a member of the household, part of the building, not the Builder, “who is God.” (Heb. iii. 1—4, &c.) “They shall hang upon Him all the glory of His Father’s house, the offspring and the issue, all vessels of small quantity, from the vessels of cups, even to all the vessels of flagons.” (Is. xxii. 24, 25.)

The remaining subjects of the Epistle harmonize with this view ; *i.e.*, as to the *rest*, *priesthood*, and *covenant* of this house. These are as follow :—Its conformity to the Gentile type of Melchisedeck, as well as that of Aaron. Its inheritance of an inviolable promise, a double promise, involved in the oath of God. The new Covenant hope within the Veil. The real, substantial, spiritual sacrifices, by the Holy Ghost given to us. The clean conscience, and assured mind of its members. Its one, and eternal propitiation for sin. The perfect, ever-

lasting sanctification of its members. The nearness and boldness of access to God in Christ in prayer. The duty of public assembly, for confession, and worship of God. The perfection of the new work of grace, known, substantiated, and evidenced to faith now ; and assured to all its members, at the gathering together in one of all united in the Head, "both in heaven and in earth." The constant and present *oneness* of character manifested in all its members, by the one principle of life which has operated from the beginning to uniform obedience and devotion. Such appear to be the general contents. (v. vi. vii. v. 12—14 ; vi. 17—20 ; vi. 1—8 ; vii. 12—17 ; ix. 12—15—25, 26 ; x. 14—18, 19—22, 23—25, 36, 37 ; xi. xii ; Ephes. i. 10.)

This, then, is the Book where we may rationally look for an appropriation to Himself of the predicted day of holy rest and worship, on the completion of His Church ; but in consistency with all the previous prophecies and facts in holy writ. And this accordingly we find—not a formal prescription, but a conclusion, on grounds presumed to have been established before.

The leading subject of the book is evidently the subjection of all things, not those of Moses alone, but of "the first man" as well, and therefore of the holy rest made for the Man, to Him of whom Adam and Moses were types ; but both of them servants to "the second Man, who is the Lord from heaven : " the quickening Spirit in all His seed ; and not merely the natural, and involuntary progenitor of a race. He is the foundation, top, and corner stone ; the Creator of each lively stone ! The Builder of the House ! This whole truth, or gospel, is comprised in His rest at the completion of His work. (1 Cor. xv ; Col. i. 26, 27 ; Heb. ii. 5.)

We behold, *now*, the faint vestiges alone of man's original supremacy, in the subjection of each class, material, vegetable, and animal, to its superior class; and of all the classes to rational and immortal man. But we see the Head exalted; and presently the complete restoration of all things, with man regenerated and redeemed, body and soul, will be secured in glory. So that the whole work is His! And the Holy Rest is His! "*The Lord's Day!*"

It may be asked, indeed, why this statement as to the holy rest of the Church should be postponed to the late period of the Apostolic age, when the Hebrews was written.

This is not the only proof, nor even the leading proof of the New Testament. Men talk, indeed, of our inability to point out "a tittle of evidence" there. I hope to show that it contains irrefragable *proof* of our obligation to keep the first, or "Lord's Day," as a holy rest. The growth of error in the Church, adulterations of the gospel with the law, were gradual; and met by St. Paul as exigencies of the day claimed attention. Abrogation of the law, the priesthood, and covenant of the Jews, and of their Sabbath, therefore, as the covenant sign, are proved in this Epistle; and the vanity of the Jewish notion, sought to be engrafted by Judaizing converts on the gospel, *i.e.*, the subjection of all men to the Mosaic dispensation, gloriously administered under Messiah as its Head, is decisively refuted. But the *actual abolition* of Mosaic Institutions was silently and surely effected, by an under current of Providential power; guided by an invisible, and Almighty hand. The Apostles, especially St. Paul, became where it could be conscientiously done, "as Jews to win" the Jews to

Christ. They united in the worship of the Synagogue, to a late period of the Gentile Apostle's ministry. The period of departure from this custom is known. The danger of Judaizing tenets was becoming imminent ; then the whole subject of the law, including the Sabbath, and after the public and exclusive sanctification of the first day by St. Paul's directions and example had been established, was entered into, and finally decided in this Epistle. In Bible chronology, the separation of disciples from the Jews, their synagogue, and Sabbath at Ephesus, was A.D., 59. This Epistle is dated A.D., 64. The Apostle saw clearly that the Saviour's direction to "let them alone," had been fulfilled ; and that longer forbearance could only introduce more "trouble" into the Church. (Matt. xx. Matt. xxiii. 2, 3 ; Acts vi. 14 ; Gal. ii. ; 1 Thess. ii. 14—16.) This may meet the question as to this Epistle, and for the present. But difficulties, and even unanswerable difficulties are not any reason for the rejection of truth. At the proper time the *transference* of the day of rest will be, it is hoped, fully shewn. Whilst the most tender caution was manifested, not needlessly to offend the Jew, yet, when the time for decisive action arrived, we shall find the Apostle, here and everywhere, equally careful not to mislead the Gentiles, through Sabbatical, and other common observances of the law, to which the Judaizing converts so tenaciously clung.

Comparison of the fifteenth chapter of Acts with the first and second chapters of the Galatians, will shew with what difficulties the Church had to contend in a continuance of the Mosaic institutions on the one hand, and their predetermined, and proclaimed abolition on the other. The *preaching* of this to the Gentiles would

necessarily stand in obvious and embarrassing contrast to the practice of Jewish converts, and even of the Apostles themselves. (Acts xviii. 13, 18, 21.) It must have been certainly a strong current to carry away such men as Peter, and Barnabas, into all the perils of dissimulation ; and even after an Apostolical edict under the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost ; and in passing which Peter himself had taken such a prominent part ! (Acts xv.) A clear and decided view of this state of things, in the days of the inspired writers of the New Testament, can alone preserve the mind from confusion and error, as to many parts of the Epistles. To this opposition in men's sentiments and feelings, we must understand such passages as Rom. xiv. 5, 6, &c.—xv. 8, 9 ; Col. ii. 16, 17. To apply these to Christian, instead of Jewish ordinances, is to wrest them from the context and analogy of faith. General principles are established in such places, arising in the passing exigencies of the Church, and of *permanent* obligation in this general sense alone.

Not one instance is to be found, I believe, of apostolical sanction of the Jewish Sabbath but upon the same principle of charitable expediency, and condescension to the consciences of weaker brethren. (Rom. xiv. ; 1 Cor. ix. 19—23.)

Burnside endeavours to render the conduct of the apostles as to the Sabbath of much avail to his Sabbatarian views, but in vain. (See Guyse's Exposition of Acts xx. Vol. ii. p. 218 ; also Burnside.) On an hypothesis that St. Paul's observations apply to the first day of holy rest, it must be assumed that this was observed by the Romans and Colossians distinctively from all other days, and in opposition to some competing view of the Sabbath.

This would concede the question at issue : nothing would be then left but for opponents to show that this observance was on other than the ground of moral and divine obligation. Independent of the general argument arising in St. Paul's invariable opposition to Judaizing tendencies and adulterations in every epistle, the context in Colossians comprises the whole subject of our completeness in Christ ; and, consequently, the total abrogation of the Mosaic law, as a "*handwriting blotted out.*" (Col. ii. 8—15.) And his conclusion in the nineteenth verse rests upon this as to *days*, new moons, and the *Mosaic Sabbaths*; followed by a declaration that the whole "*body*" of truth involved in those legal shadows had been transferred, and existed in Christ. The "*Sabbaths*" included, necessarily, the seventh-day Sabbath ; because deriving their nature from it, and their obligation being referred by God Himself to the common principle which pervades the Decalogue. (Lev. xxiii. 3, 30.)

The apostle explains in this epistle what is intended by his leading subject, "a subjection of the world to come" to man, under the great High Priest and Head of the church, Christ Jesus. It is the works of the new creation, by which man is restored in Christ to the rest, excellence, dignity, dominion, and final glory, lost by sin. A more minute description of this is given in the Revelation, in all its glorious results.

The apostle then calls on the Hebrews to "consider Christ Jesus, the Apostle and High Priest of our profession." (iii. 1, 3, 12.) The new covenant head of this new creation, or world to come ! Faithful as Moses and foretold by him ; superseding him in his prophetic office, (Deut. xviii. 19,) and, uniting to it an

unchangeable priesthood ; superseding, consequently, that covenant, with all its shadowy ordinances, and burthensome ceremonies ; and the day of holy rest, therefore, as their covenant sign. (Heb. vii. 12.)

Burnside denies, indeed, that Christ is even mentioned in connection with the rest of His people in the fourth chapter. But whose rest is spoken of in the first verse (iii. 6—14. ; iv. 1.)? Christ—the church—partakers of Christ—the rest of Christ—His entrance, and that of the church with Him into His rest, are inseparably interwoven throughout the context. It appears plain, indeed, that mention of an exercise of his His divine offices is sustained from the *third chapter* to the close of the tenth. Let any person, however, consider the import of the apostle's "*therefore*," in the *second chapter* ; followed by the "*wherefore*" of the *third* ; by the reiterated "*therefore*" of the fourth ; and the pursuit of his argument, thenceforward, from the work and rest of Jesus, with the inferential "*for*," in the *fifth*, until the chief argument is closed at the tenth chapter, and nineteenth verse ; and then determine how very wide of the fact is this assertion.

To demonstrate the pre-eminence, and priestly qualifications of Christ, in the great work of man's restoration to the lost favour of God, and to the forfeited supremacy of Adam, two proofs are offered :—

I.—That He is the *Creator, Proprietor, Head*, as well as *High Priest* of this house, or church ; the pattern of which Moses received as a servant ; ministering only to that end which Christ Jesus had originally proposed, finally secured, and eternally sustains. (iii. 4—6.)

II.—That He is the author of that *new rest* foretold by David, subsequently to the Sinaitic rest ; to that in

Canaan by the hand of Joshua ; and distinct from that which was ordained from "the foundation of the world, when God did rest from all His works"—(2, 3, 4) ; distinct, also, from the spiritual rest enjoyed always in the souls of believers ; and, much more, distinct from that rest in heaven which was not first revealed by David, nor by him as a future and peculiar *gospel* blessing.

The manner of introducing this holy rest is in obvious analogy to the creation Sabbath. He had just referred to the building of the "house," or church of Christ,—events in this "world to come," as proving His Deity, and indicating His work and will as one with the Father. (1, 3—6, 7—19.) For, the very first act on completion of the old creation was an institution of the holy rest of God the Father. And, so, in this new creation, the very first act of God the Son is an establishment of "the day of the Lord," according to the prediction of the Psalmist, when "the stone became the head of the corner." (v. 1—9.

Nor could anything attest more certainly the deity and sovereignty of Christ than this appropriation in His own spiritual works of a fundamental law in the natural creation, and worship, to His own service and glory. So truly did He declare, "for what things soever He (the Father) doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." (John v. 19.) That this appropriation was a prominent point in the apostle's mind is evident, in his care to negative every rest in the Scriptures which might be mistaken for this ; as we shall presently see more in detail. Whilst he knew what incontestable proof it must offer of providential arrangement from the beginning, to secure this identity, in counsel and operation of the Father, and the Son, as well as this

institution of a holy rest in both heads of man ; he yet knew what a stumbling block it would be to the Jew ; not slow to apprehend an abrogation of their covenant, together with their priesthood and covenant sign. However, in the same way transference of the kingly sceptre to the hand of Christ argues a change of the law from the old covenant to the new ; as there must be law, where there is ruling power. (See Perkins.)

His warnings, therefore, are very solemnly delivered against unbelief. The whole argument demands most scrupulous attention. (Heb. iii. 7—19. ; iv. 1.)

I.—He declares the revelation of this rest to be comprehensive of “the gospel,” or whole scheme of salvation, preached in this rest from the first delivery of the prediction both to Jews and Gentiles. (ii. 3. ; iv. 1, 2.) It was not, therefore, the prophecy merely of an isolated *fact*, however eminent ; but of an all-comprehensive *truth* involved in that fact. It is enjoyed, therefore, by those who as the very reason, essence, and end of that fact, rest from sin in the perfected work of Christ’s salvation in their soul, and *sabbatize* with Jesus in *this day*, “which the Lord hath made,” with rejoicing and “gladness.” It follows, and proves Christ’s completion of the gospel work of salvation. It embodies all the truth of the Sabbath generally observed at Sin, on Israel’s deliverance from the bondage of Egypt, in a reception of the true bread from heaven. It imparts *body* to the shadow which envelopes the prescription of Mount Sinai, and is reflective like that, of the essential truth incorporated in the holy rest of Jehovah at the creation of all things ; completing in this sign of man’s new creation, and sanctification, and perfection by Christ, what had existed as the sign of his creation in God’s image and likeness at

the beginning. In the same manner the original holy rest comprised in itself the whole truth of the first covenant law, of which it was the sign: viz., the perfection of righteousness, worship, and holy peace; terminating, like the gospel rest, in perfection for ever.

II.—It is declared, further, that this Rest is that of “Christ Jesus,” as “*the Apostle and High Priest of our profession.*” (iii. 10—14; iv. 1; 2 Cor. ix. 13. [N.B.]) Hence, it must be contemporary with this “profession.” And as in the ordinary usage of the term, this is the united work of the members of the Church, so, this “rest of their profession” must be common to the whole body, be enjoyed by them in their corporate capacity in this present world, and must endure until this “profession” shall cease.

It is not easy to see on what ground the apostle’s argument would rest, nor what could unite the premises to the conclusion, were this the “heavenly rest that remains,” which was not revealed for the first time by the Psalmist; and which does not receive its distinctive *peculiarity* from the Gospel alone. Neither does it consist in the *measure* of light with which, comparatively, the heavenly rest is now revealed; for this would not meet the apostle’s argument; and we know no more of its realities now, than was known under and before the law. It is comprehensive of the *whole of Gospel truth*, extends to its whole “profession,” and is not restricted to its full and final enjoyment. The work which he had to perform in the building of His house; the message which He had to deliver for its government; the worship which he had to lead, as the “Apostle and High Priest of our profession;” the acceptance for which He had to plead, as our Advocate with God; in a spiritual celebration of His completed

triumph over all enemies—are all evidently comprehended in this rest of Christ Jesus.

III.—It was marked by *a cessation from His own works* in the new creation, as Jehovah's by rest on completion of the works at the creation of all things. (iii. 11 ; iv. 10.) It is called, "my rest ;" *i.e.*, God's : and His rest ; *i.e.*, Christ's. And it is subsequent to that which occurred at the "works finished from the foundation of the world." (iv. 3.) Though revealed to David, yet the apostle thinks it necessary to carry the mind back to the very beginning, to obviate mistake.

IV.—Moreover, he distinguishes it with an observable care from every rest in time *past*, with which it might have been confounded, but which was not very likely had it been rest in heaven.

The spiritual rest of believers, into which there was always a *present* entrance, "we *do* enter ;" *i.e.*, David, and all believers ; but this was *future*. (iii. 16—19 ; iv. 3, 4. Owen. Vol. ii.) Nor was it the Sinaitic rest, or "the *seventh*," the ordinary denomination of the Jewish sabbath. And lastly, it was not the rest in Canaan in Joshua's day.

Now, it is plain that there must have been an analogy between the *nature* of this rest intended, and all of those repudiated ; and a close analogy, too, or where could have been the liability to error ?

Should it be asked how a believing Israelite of David's day entered into this rest, the reply is easy : as He did into all other gospel truth foretold, through faith in the type or shadow in which it was portrayed by the Mosaic system. In this way the "Gospel was preached to them." (Heb. iv. 2.) His faith would discern in the revelation, a future and better state of

the Church, and of its rest, than any which had preceded. His perception was necessarily shadowy and dim. That it was "another *day*" of holy rest, substituted for the Mosaic Sabbath, might be lost to his vision, probably, in the obscurity of that dispensation, which their bigotted adherence to the law, as their covenant, with its sign seems to prove. But, by a heart graciously disposed, and prepared for the revelations of the great Prophet that should arise, the mind would be "willing in the day of God's power," for a change of Covenant, or whatever might be involved in their full reception. And thus the apostle exhorts *believers* to strenuous efforts, that they might certify to themselves the great, final, and eternal design of this earthly rest; and prepare for it, as "our Fore-runner is for us entered already." (Heb. iv. 10, 11.) Men cannot enter now into this "sabbatizing" of Jesus, strictly speaking, by the mere observance of Sunday;—nor, but as they enter by faith into *all* the truth and blessedness of that new creation, of which the resurrection and day of the Lord are the completion in the *Head*, the preparation and pledge in the *body*. This appears emphatically in an exhortation to "fear," lest the *entire* blessing involved in this rest, as a *preaching of the gospel*, should not be apprehended. (iv. 1.) The expression employed by him, therefore, literally means, "by want of conformity" to the promise of this rest.—A solemn warning, surely, against all laxity of sentiment or conduct on the subject. As this rest was one from which unbelieving Israelites were to be judicially excluded, so was it subsequent to this blindness inflicted by the retributive wrath of God. (iii. 11.) For, after reciting God's righteous retribution on

rebellion and unbelief in the wilderness, on those whom He had delivered out of Egypt, He proceeds to warn succeeding generations against the same sin and exclusion from His rest here and for ever.

In the apostle's negation of "the seventh," or Mosaic Sabbath, as the rest foretold, his quotation of the words of its original institution, when "the works were finished from the foundation of the world;" I do not see how that appointment at the Creation is to be evaded. (Heb. iv. 3, 4.)

I am aware of the late Dr. A. Clarke's interpretation of "the foundation of the world" in the Ephesians, as meaning sometimes the Mosaic, and at other times the gospel dispensations; and which can hardly consist with a subsequent portion of that Epistle. (Eph. i. 4; iii. 10, 11.) Great and good men are not always devoid of peculiar prejudices and opinions. I suspect, indeed, that it is a very difficult thing for men of great intellectual power, and literary attainments, to avoid the pride of peculiarity of sentiment.

The common notion that the apostle means the rest in heaven alone, appears to me the more untenable the more it is examined.

In the Psalm containing the original prediction, there is an evident reference to the rest in Canaan; whilst yet the apostle applies that rest and decree of God to gospel times. (xev. 7—11.) There was, therefore, a meaning in their possession of rest in Canaan extended, in the Divine mind, beyond the Mosaic dispensation. Possession of an earthly rest in a world of disquiet, and wandering was its *primary* object alone. And thus, *our* rest has likewise both a primary and ultimate relation. But how, in its application to

“the gospel,” all relation to the earth is to be excluded, and the meaning restricted to the rest in heaven, is not easily understood : and especially, as this would indeed put into the conclusion what would not be contained in the premises at all. Moreover, that rest is distinctly mentioned in the like relation to us, who sabbatize with Jesus here, as our earthly rest stands to the Israelites, who had entered with Joshua into the rest of the promised land.

And how could any conclusion be elicited as to the rest in heaven by showing that it was not any of the various rests appointed in earth in all time *past* ? For, this would leave intact the church in earth in gospel, times ; whereas it is specifically “the gospel,” and peculiar to *the gospel* : which is not the case with the rest in heaven in the least—the gospel preached to us and to them. Rest in *heaven* has been the common hope of God’s servants, substantially the same at all times ; their “better country,” as “the recompense of reward.” (Heb. xi. 15, 16, 26.) It is not, indeed, impossible but that *all* these rests may prefigure “the glory which shall be revealed in us.” (Ephes. i. 10 ; Heb. xii. 22, 23 ; Dan. vii. 22, 27.)

Owen asks most pertinently, “What are the works from which they (believers) are said to rest ? Their sins, say some ; their labours, and sorrows, and sufferings, say others : from these they rest in heaven. But how can they be said to rest from these works ‘as God rested from His own ?’ For, God so rested from His as to take the greatest delight and satisfaction in them,” [not, I would add, simply because they were finished,] (Exod. xxxi. 17,) “to be refreshed by them. He so rested from them, as that He rested *in* them, and blessed

and sanctified the time wherein they were finished. Indeed, God's rest from, and upon His works, besides a mere cessation of working, consisted, principally, in the satisfaction and complacency that He had in them. But, now, if those mentioned be the works here intended, man cannot so rest from them as God did in His. But they cease from them, with a detestation of them as far as they are sinful ; and joy for their deliverance from them as far as they are sorrowful. Now, this is not to rest as God rested. Again, when are men supposed to rest from these works ? It cannot be in this world : for here we rest not at all from temptations, sufferings, and sorrows ; and in that mortification which we attain unto, we are to fight continually, resisting even unto blood. It must, therefore, be in heaven that they so rest ; and this is affirmed accordingly. But this utterly excludes the rest in, and of, the gospel from the apostle's discourse, and enervates it ; so as that his whole present argument is nothing to his purpose."

The term which is rendered "rest" is, literally, "sabbatizing." It is not the same as that which is used throughout the argument ; it is employed in this verse alone, and not in any other part of the New Testament. The other word is, *καταπαυσις* (*katapausis*.) (iii. 11, 18 ; iv. 1, 3, 8.)

If the apostle do not speak of a *heavenly* rest, then this implies a holy "sabbatizing" here. The word is one of those nouns which derive their origin from the *verb*, inverting the more usual formation of the *verb* from the *noun* ; and conveying an idea subsequent to that of the verb, *σαββατιζω*. For, "sabbatizing," and all that is connected with it, originates in *the act* of God, who *rested* on, and in, the completed work of creation.

And to this *act*, as the formal reason, is ascribed the foundation of the fourth commandment. In the same way, λογισμος, *reasoning*, and other words in μος, are derived from verbs with the same termination in ζω. And thus, also, the "*sabbatizing*" of God's people now arises in *the act* of rest in His works by their Head ; who thus substantiates His right to do all things which the Father hath done.

It is said, in "The Modern Sabbath Examined," "both these expressions are of the same force and meaning. For, were it otherwise, there would be more in the conclusion than in the premises, which would invalidate the whole of the apostle's argument."

To me this appears to "invalidate" the interpretation of it as the rest in heaven. For, earthly *sabbatizing* is not precisely that which is *sabbatizing* in heaven. This is *perpetual* and *incessant* ; not, at intervals, measured and recurring by the same portions of duration otherwise occupied. It is, indeed, "more" than earthly *sabbatizing*.

If it be intended that *katapausis* cannot be properly applied to an earthly *sabbatizing*, this is opposed to *the fact* of its application, in this very sense, in the context ; and to the full sabbatizing even of heaven itself, in the 11th verse. (iv. 3, 4.)

Our Lord, generally, uses another word for rest, because inclusive of other ideas ; as power, peace from above, &c. In the last passage cited, the final, eternal rest is indicated : and the preposition entering into the word to impart the sense of *going upward*, seems beautifully to intimate the impossibility of complete rest here below. (Matt. xi. 28, 29 ; xii. 43 ; xxvi. 45 ; John xi. 13 ; Acts ix. 31, ειρηνην, "peace ;" 2 Thess. i. 7, ανεισιν.)

But *katapausis* signifies cessation *from any work*; and rest, such as that which is taken after active exertion, by sitting down. And hence it is used to express the act of sitting down, and the relief from fatigue obtained by this *quiet*, (*sedatio.*)

There is consistency in this meaning with the prominent ideas of *sabbatical* rest. For, there is completion of, and cessation from, work : satisfaction in this, and renewal of the powers by rest. As the term may be thus appropriately, and, unquestionably, in a philological sense, applied to the sabbath, how is it possible to put “more into the conclusion than is contained in the premises,” by understanding the “sabbatizing,” in the 9th verse, of a holy rest on earth ?

It is easily seen why the apostle used different expressions in his premises and conclusion. In the first part of his argument, all the *rests* mentioned are not purely *sabbatical*; whilst they were all upon earth : and all involved the characteristic features. But this, in his conclusion, is upon earth ; of a purely sabbatical nature ; ushered in by the perfected work of Christ, and terminating immediately in “the day approaching,” the day of His advent in glory, and when “His rest shall be glory.”

With the change in the scene of this observance, and all that is absolutely connected with time and with the church on earth, in an undeniable, perfect, and eternal rest, he returns to the word indicative of the leading ideas ; and the necessary cessation of all in it that was of this earth. And even here the *elementary* features of a completed work, and instant rest, are preserved. And it is observable, surely, that the same word, in another form, is used in the Septuagint to express the Creator’s

rest on the seventh day: "and He sabbatized on the seventh day." (Owen on the Hebrews, Vol. IV., p. 344.)

The substitution "of another day," and this upon earth, for the seventh-day sabbath of the Law seems to be plain: for this is not, it is asserted, the day predicted by the Psalmist; whilst, yet, it was a preaching of the *gospel*, both to Jews and Gentiles, as a holy rest; and when there are neither Jews nor Gentiles in heaven.

And, although it be not the Mosaic seventh day, for it is "another day,"—an expression strictly proper to this earth alone,—yet, it is *a holy rest*, and as inseparably connected with "the gospel;" so it is most significantly and appropriately denominated, in characteristic gospel simplicity and freedom, "*sabbatizing*!"

This "sabbatizing remaineth;" *i.e.*, in a period subsequent to some former period, and in something *like* what had existed before, and proved, by the context, to be subsequent to the previous dispensations; *existing* when it was spoken of in present time: and, as it was a preaching of the gospel to Jews and Gentiles, so in the gospel day.

It implies, moreover, the taking away of something which had preceded this "sabbatizing;" and had been analogous in its nature. It "remaineth" (now) "to the people of God,"—as there had always existed a rest among the people of God,—from the beginning. But were this exclusively the rest in heaven, where character is of one kind alone, what contrast or force could there be in this phrase, "the people of God?" And thus it "remaineth" to us, in the *gospel preached to them*, by this holy rest: identifying both the people, or church of God, and their rest, as, in principle and obligation, one and the same. (Heb. iv. 2, 9.)

And, it should be observed how this conclusion carries us back to the source in which this argument arose. It "remaineth to the people of God," the seed of promise, of "the second Man," for whom it was made : to those in whom "the word preached, and heard, is mixed with faith." (iv. 2 ; iii. 14, 6.) To "the partakers of Christ." Who are "the house of His building." Who, therefore, rest on its completion in and with Him, as their Foundation, Head, and Hope. For, "He that is entered into His rest," *i.e.*, Jesus Christ, "hath also ceased from His own works, as God did from His." (iv. 10.) I suspect that when men read this, they generally think of heaven alone, and as a state in distant futurity ! (See Burnside, pp. 157—159.) But, *when* did the Lord Christ actually, and literally enter into His rest ? "Not on Sunday," says Burnside ; "but, either on Friday, according to His words to the converted malefactor ; or, on Thursday, when He ascended on high !" (P. 159, note.) As if the *place* constituted the *rest* ! The *work* of death was not *finished* until the resurrection. The *rest* was not entered until the *whole Christ*, so to speak, participated of that state. This the Psalm distinctly marks. (xvi. 9, 10.) It was at the very instant of resurrection ! On the *first day*, which was His rest day ! "The Lord's day !" The day which introduced the *state* of rest ; when Jesus was "crowned with glory and honour !" When He declared "all power *is* given to Me in heaven, and in earth." His work was completed ; and His rest begun. And believers now "sabbatize" with Jesus, "the second Man," in His new and perfected creation, and holy day, as the first man in the old creation sabbatized with the Father.

The word employed in the original demands attention ;

it is ἀπολείπεται, “remaineth.” The prepositions, ἀπο and ὑπο, are well known as derived from a Hebrew word which means *the root*. As ἀπο expresses distance from the *root*, so it is used in this meaning here. There is, indeed, a remarkable propriety, so far as I have traced them, in the use of the Greek prepositions and particles in the New Testament. The force seems to be here, that, although typical and ceremonial peculiarities of the Mosaic church, and of that preceding it, as to the various rests and the sabbath, had been put *at a distance*, and *separated* from the people of God, by this onward movement under the gospel; yet, that “sabbatizing,” as of immutable principle and obligation, is carried forward, and “remains.” So had it been after the Fall; liberation out of Egypt; establishment of the Mosaic system of administration: and this it still remains. And, hence, the compound verb is used; when, otherwise, the simple form might have well expressed the meaning.

It is asserted by Burnside, (p. 158,) as to this *remaining* rest, or sabbatizing of God's people:—“It is not now possessed by them as it would be were the weekly sabbath intended; and they enter into it now, only because they shall as certainly have it, as if they had it already, and because grace is the evidence, the beginner, and the foretaste of glory. The pronoun, ‘*he*,’ who is said to have entered into his rest, as God did into His, is not the substitute for Christ, whose name had never been mentioned but for *people* in the preceding verse, which, in the original, is in the singular number, as well as masculine; who, whether taken individually or collectively, will as certainly have ceased

from their work ; or, as the apostle has it, ‘rest from their labour, as God did from His.’”

This argument rests upon a false assumption ; and the argument states erroneously the very point contained in that of the apostle.

That which is said to “remain,” bears a relation to what was *past*, undoubtedly ; but it has also *present* existence. In the Psalm it is *future* ; has its assigned signification as “the gospel,” to which it is exclusively attached ; and in it alone *actually* possessed ; whereas, *heaven* has no such peculiarity in relation to the Gospel.

It is not the *gospel* which was put into past time relatively to the rest in heaven, so as to leave the *possession* of this rest in the distant *future*, but all previous rests that had passed away, so as to leave *this* which is “the gospel” present, or “remaining.” (Burnside, p. 158.) It “remaineth” as it is present, not future. Had he said, “there *will* remain a rest for,” &c., the case had been different. The contrast is between the rests of former dispensations, and this rest of an existing, or gospel, dispensation. His exhortation to believers is, that they receive not simply *the day*, but that they ensure, in their reception of *this*, an interest in the entire blessing ; as Jesus both perfected His work, and entered first into His rest with the Church here ; and *then*, into that “Jerusalem which is above.”

The Israelites were exhorted by the Psalmist, to a *present* entrance into that which was “the gospel preached to them.” And so *we* are exhorted to enter into it not as it is, nor because it is, an ordinance for worship alone ; but as it is, and because it is “the gospel,” enveloped in the ordinance, and founded on a

fact which is the very key-stone of the Church of Christ. No unbeliever enters actually into this rest ; with whatever sanctimonious rigour he may keep the *day*, which proves how much of truth is comprised in a sanctification of this rest of the Lord Jesus ; and what a constant preaching it is, so to speak, of the gospel of salvation. To suppose that the question as to this holy rest involves merely the belief in a prescribed portion of time for Christian worship, would be a very contracted view of its real meaning and importance ; and implicate a small measure of the peril really attendant on its denial. If it be "the gospel," involving the whole work of grace it is the fulfilled *sign* of our dispensation ; a rejection of which cannot very well consist with a hearty and full retention of the *thing signified*. (See p. 268). It is not a mere abstinence from ordinary avocations, and an external observance of religious duties alone ; but such a holy consecration of it as realizes, by faith, the whole gospel truth, and salvation comprised in the holy rest day of the Son of Man, "the Lord of the Sabbath : " and which is denominated, so appropriately, therefore, "THE LORD'S DAY."

In the conclusion of Burnside's argument, the leading point of the apostle's is untouched. It is not the "certainty" of this rest to the believer, as the certainty of God's, that is intended ; but a rest on the identical grounds, and the same in its nature and design, as God's at the beginning. Owen has, in my judgment, decided the question unanswerably as to the believer. The analogy is between the work and rest of God the Father, and the work and rest of God the Son.

After a rejection of *Moses* in the comparison with

Jesus, and surely of all the members of his house—another proof that it is not the heavenly rest—is it to be supposed that the *believer* and his work and rest, and much less an abstract quality attached to it, would be admitted as identical with the work and rest of Jehovah?

And not only is it not the fact that “Christ is not mentioned,” but He is never lost sight of, from the first verse of the first chapter to the end of the fourth, and, indeed, of the tenth. It is easy to trace Him as the *antecedent* throughout the context. He is “the Son,” who has completed the revelations of “the Father;” one with Him, in the Creation of all things, old and new. (i. 42.) He is “the Lord speaking to us from heaven,” to whom the more earnest heed is to be given, as “the power of God, and the wisdom of God” (ii. 1—3.) He is “the apostle and High Priest of our profession,” whose glorious character, offices, and work, demand our undivided and intense “consideration” (iii. 1.): lest we should ultimately “fall short of His rest,” by cleaving to any measure of the Judaical bondage, instead of rejoicing in the gospel truth and freedom of His holy rest day; and entering into all its significance and blessing. (iv. 11.)

The apostle, having exhibited Jesus Christ in an exercise of His prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices, as revealing finally, the Father’s will; completing His own house in the works of truth, grace, and salvation; and appointing His own day of rest for his people’s rejoicing, assurance, and perfection; “crowned with glory and honour; presenting their prayers, and subjecting all things to man as his Head; brings his main argument to a close in the tenth chapter. And

the more his peroration is considered, the more clearly does it implicate a day of rest, and of united worship in the Church below, as established in his preceding argument. (1 Pet. ii. 4—10 ; Heb. x. 19, 25.) He begins the summary of his topics at the eighth chapter. "Now, of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum." In the ninth, the ordinances of divine service under the first covenant are specified, maintaining the characteristic feature of analogy between the leading features of both covenants. In the tenth, the general character of the law as the "shadow of good things to come," is asserted ; especially of the one and infinite sacrifice for sin. And then, on this ground, he points out the "boldness" with which the Church may now approach to God through Jesus, with occasional parentheses according to his manner throughout, to the tenth chapter, and nineteenth verse. In *this conclusion*, and as the very point of the whole argument, an exhortation is introduced to a *right employment of this holy rest-day of the gospel*. But if this did not relate to sabbatical observance, there would be in the conclusion what is not found in the premises at all.

There could not be any necessity for an exhortation of "holy brethren" to enter by faith into a *spiritual rest* actually possessed, any more than into any of those previously received ; nor, indeed, into the rest of heaven, assured to all that believe. But these Hebrews like the Romans, perhaps, might be weak in faith, as to an abolition of the covenant sign of the law.

There is a manifest consistency in this view with the whole context. (iv. 11—16.) The faith and obedience of Israel were to be proved in their desire and endeavour to realize all the privileges, blessings, and practical expe-

rience in the ways and goodness of God, held out to them in their possession of the promised inheritance, in all the ceremonial shadows, natural truth of the Mosaic dispensation, and in the sabbath as their covenant sign.

And the "partakers of Christ" confess in His rest, in each recurring "assembly" for worship on "the Lord's day," their perfection in Christ, present, and eternal. It seems evident, from the apostle's exhortation of these Hebrews (x. 25,) to an assembly for public worship, that there must have been a *stated time*; that this was neglected in opposition to his views of duty; disputed, and not merely neglected, because "forsaken" by "some;" and that this time could not be the seventh-day sabbath, which *Hebrews* would be ready enough to honour; and among whom these "perverse disputings" about Mosaic observances arose. (2 Pet. ii. 10.) And after the conclusion of a principal argument in this Epistle he pursues the subject in a very observable manner. "Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus," &c.... "*not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is*, and so much the more as ye see the day approaching." (x. 19—25.) The duty of public worship; an observance of it by St. Paul, and the church ("ourselves"); an opposition to the custom by "some" systematically: are all undeniably implied. (x. 24, 25; Ephes. ii. 18.) They could hardly be open, indeed, to reproof for that which was uncertain, occasional alone, or left to each person's own discretion.

The 13th verse of the 3rd chapter bears no parallelism to this, not as much as the 24th verse of the 10th; which, yet, would not substantiate such a strained interpretation. These passages relate to duties at all times

incumbent on Christians; and of a *personal, private* nature. The apostle, in his conclusion of the chief argument, exhorts the church to the *public* duty of assembling as a body, for the *public* worship and confession of Christ; or, as "the house of God." (x. 25; iii. 6.) If, the passages adduced stand in any connection with this, it is only in the influence on daily and private duties arising in the blessing promised to the stated, united, and public worship of God, as means connected with all gracious ends. (Matt. xviii. 19, 20.) Then, indeed, the people of God receive in its double measure that "spiritual meat, the true bread from heaven, the bread of God, which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world." (1 Cor. x. 3; John vi. 31—34.) On the same principle, the apostle marked the deleterious influence on personal religion occasioned by an abuse of the public means of grace: "for this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." (1 Cor. xi. 18—30.)

Opposition to the continuing obligation of a day of holy rest, on divine and moral grounds, is founded *on abolition of the Mosaic institutions; because with these, it is contended, the Sabbath has altogether ceased.* With the consideration of this, the supposed corroborative difficulties in the Romans and Colossians, will stand in a natural connection.

It appears indispensable to discern clearly between *the old covenant*, as simply contrasted with *the new covenant*; the same *old covenant* as adapted to the Mosaic institutions; and *the peculiar covenant* of God with Israel, as the seed of Abraham after the flesh.

The old covenant is, in strictness, the covenant of nature, or of works; which secured God's blessing to

man, on condition of a literal and perfect righteousness, by an unsinning obedience to its prescriptions. *The new covenant* is altogether of grace ; and *eternal life* under it “is *the gift* of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.” By this “a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.” (Rom. iii. 28 ; vi. 23.)

It is indispensable to personal holiness and peace that there be not any confusion in the mind as to these. The *conditions* of the one and *the grace* of the other united together, even as concurrent causes of salvation, will deprive the soul of that peace which is attendant on the knowledge and assurance of our free and full justification in Christ alone. This is *the grace* of the new covenant ; but the other is *the qualification* of the old covenant. Any attempt to combine, or confound, these two things would be the old offence : a seeking of the bondman to inherit as co-heir with the freeman of God. It is too common, I suspect, for the mind to be secretly, and unconsciously perhaps, leaning upon some species, or mark of *qualification* by inherent righteousness, for the realization and enjoyment of a personal interest in the gospel of our salvation.

It may be repeated here, that “the covenant made with the fathers,” was a reiteration of the covenant of grace. (Gen. xxii.)

The covenant *made with Israel in Horeb* was the first covenant entered into with Adam, and adapted to the church-state established at Sinai. This was allegorized by Hagar, and binding, originally, upon all the flesh-born seed of Adam, as the federal head. (Gal. iv. 21—31.)

A record is given in the 15th chapter of Genesis of a covenant made with Abraham. (Verse 18.) This is the

covenant of inheritance with the seed of Abraham after the flesh ; preceding the Sinaitic covenant above 400 years, independent of it, and unaffected by its abrogation. And when the covenant of grace is formally entered into with that patriarch, in the 17th chapter, this covenant of inheritance is *recited* again, as it appears, for two reasons.

I.—To record the nature of the tenure, and which was not named before ; *viz.*, that it was “an everlasting covenant ;” or, otherwise, it would have been abrogated with the Sinaitic covenant to which it was only an appendage, when that became extinct on an introduction of the covenant of grace. (Gen. xvii. 7 ; xxii. 18 ; Gal. iii. 15, 16 ; xvii. 13 ; Gen.)

II.—It maintained in this type of our joint-heirship with Christ, the character of an *inalienable inheritance* to the spiritual Israel of God. (Verses 7, 19.) And, hence, as circumcision was to Abraham “a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had being uncircumcised ;” and as Israel circumcised in the flesh is ultimately to belong to “the circumcision of the Spirit,” so does this “everlasting covenant” in their flesh run, as it were, into the covenant of grace, of which they are to partake in their inheritance restored ; whereby they and the Gentiles will become fellow-heirs, and of one body, in Christ. (Lev. xxv. 23 ; Jer. xxxi. 40 ; xxxiii. 19, 22 ; Ezek. xxxvi. 22—38.) And if this teach us to look for their restoration, then, in connection with this we may anticipate a contemporaneous effect upon the Gentiles, which will be comparatively with all that had preceded it, as St. Paul declares, “life from the dead.” (Rom. xi. 1, 15, 16.)

The blessings promised under the *peculiar* covenant of

Israel were, excepting the covenant of inheritance, common under the old covenant, adapted in this part of its provisions to the Mosaic church. They were *peculiar* blessings, because given by express covenant to them : and there is intimated by this gift their forfeiture by all men, in the breach of that covenant to which they had been originally annexed. Many, perhaps all of these, were common in the Providence of God to all the seed under the covenant of Nature ; embracing *universally*, as that of grace does *generally*, all the children of Adam. (Acts xiv. 15—17 ; xvii. 26.) However, these blessings were *conditional* on their obedience ; maintaining this pervading characteristic of the law ; and yet *free*, to mark their connection with that system of grace which the law of Moses prefigured, and of which ultimately the literal Israel would partake.

This peculiarity ensured everlasting right to the land. Length of days. Fecundity as a people. Pre-eminence among the nations. Fertility of soil. Victory over their enemies. Propitious seasons. Freedom from disease. (See Elij. Mantle. A.D. 1658. Passim)

Now, the Sabbath was originally part of the natural covenant. This embraced the natural provision of day and night, &c. ; and how much more the portion sanctified to God and man ! Its continuance seems necessarily implied in an adaptation of the first covenant to this with the descendants of Abraham. It can only be “cast out” so far as it belongs to the bond-woman and her seed. I do not see how we can avoid arguing from its prescription under the adapted covenant law of Moses, to its prescription under the original covenant between God and man ; as the very basis of that is laid on God’s perfected work, and consequent rest at the beginning.

And let the transactions attendant on Noah's departure from the Ark ; the day of their occurrence ; his solemn act of worship ; the *odour of a sweet smell* of rest ascribed to God as arising in this act, and day ; and the striking allusion, after that special covenant with Noah and all flesh, to the old covenant of Nature, be recalled to mind !

The Mosaic dispensation was a mixed state, peculiar to that church. It resembled the household of Abraham whilst this was the common habitation of the bond-woman and the free woman. (Vid. Tillinghast.) But, when the promised seed came, as when Isaac was born, this condition ceased. Their covenant and Sabbath were abolished. Their inheritance was placed in abeyance as to their special covenant right of possession in the land, to be regained at the real Jubilee. And as established long before, so it is unaffected by an abrogation of subsequent privileges and signs.

No part whatever of the moral law has, however, ceased. All has been fulfilled ; transferred from the old to the new commandment, and "the truth" is, in each, the same ; that which Jesus came to fulfil, to bear witness to it ; and infuse into it life and energy by His grace and quickening Spirit. As *this truth* existed in the old covenant, the denunciations in this against every, even "one point" of imperfection ; its promises to un-sinning obedience ; the comfort arising in a satisfaction of all its demands : these *impossibilities* to the sinner have been overcome by our Head. They have wholly disappeared. They cannot offer any interruption to our peace. For, the commands of the new covenant are "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," prescriptions efficacious by the Holy Ghost and not empty

words, "weak through the flesh." Instead of "the terrors of the Lord ;" of perpetual ejection ; of irrevocable disinheritance of every offender : there are only now the affectionate chastisements by "the Father of the Son whom He loveth." And in place of a promise restricted to "the doing of these things," to secure "the recompense of reward : " inheritance is no more to be gained by obedience, than lost by disobedience, necessarily arising in those infirmities from which human nature will never be exempted here. And thus, faith in the new covenant head establishes the old covenant law. It does not destroy "one jot or tittle" of "the law and the prophets." *Every principle* of the old commandment exists in *the new*.

And unless the *principle* of God's worship, and all the requisites to its due performance, did not enter into the old covenant law, these must be now comprised in the "sabbatizing" of the gospel.

Many Jewish converts to the gospel were scrupulous in a maintenance of the Mosaic distinctions of meats, drinks, days, and indeed of the whole law. The Apostle everywhere inculcates indifference about these things among Gentile converts to the gospel ; so that integrity was maintained in gospel truth ; in consistency with their approaching abolition. *Forbearance* was, however, enjoined by him towards those brethren who were weak in the faith. He was inflexible, nevertheless, on the completeness of believers in Christ. This is the ground of his argument in the Romans, and in Galatians. With weakness in the faith, as among the Roman converts, he would bear. With a compromise of the faith, as among the Galatians, he would not hold for a moment. Both are reprovèd ; but on separate grounds, and in a

different measure. (Rom. xiv. 2, 5, 6, 14, 21 ; Acts xv. 1 ; xxi. 20—26 ; Col. ii.)

It is evident that a rule was necessary to the Church whilst “the law” was practically existent. The spirit of this is obligatory, doubtless, upon us now as to things of the same kind. But the precise observances in which it arose are gone long ago. And it is rather too much, surely, for those who contend against all early observance whatever of a first day, so to interpret the Apostle as to include the very day to which they deny an existence as sacred. The apostle’s practice among the Jews, and the principle in which this arose are patent, and well known. (1 Cor. ix. 19—23.) And upon the same grounds it is, the law and its day of worship being in existence, that he uses the term Sabbath, the gospel being generally expressed in popular language. And how, indeed, could he do otherwise, when speaking of the Jewish Sabbath ? (Burnside. p. 124.) But he never so speaks as to implicate its continued obligation under the gospel. And yet they who would attach so much to such a trivial circumstance, cannot see any force whatever in a mention of “the Lord’s Day” by St. John ; nor in the predictions of the old Testament of a Sabbath in gospel times ! Such is the power of prejudice in a maintenance of cherished peculiarities of sentiment in opposition to a body of testimony, inferior to none by which, when dispassionately weighed, the vital doctrines of the gospel are supported !

If *the primitive Christians who met daily*, a custom of brief duration in the Church, *did yet peculiarly observe the seventh day*, on the same grounds most probably as St. Paul whilst this prevailed, they might also peculiarly observe the first day. Observance of the first day would

be, necessarily, and in a prudence harmonizing with the apostle's concessions, retired and quiet. This is further corroborated by the facts that the first two meetings on the first day, and that even at Troas, were towards the end of the day, as less likely to attract public notice and interfere with secular avocations, not to be dispensed with easily at an entrance of the gospel dispensation. They could hardly concur in an observance of the *seventh day*, and publicly contend for an exclusive sanctification of the *first day*! Nor could this observance of the seventh day be on the ground of its legal institution, as this would have bound them in an obligation to the whole law. Their reasons must be sought for, therefore, both in St. Paul's alleged delicacy of conscientious expediency, whilst the law remained; and in the moral, and immutable nature of a Sabbath; a truth prominent in the fourth commandment. Thus, the claims of the first day would be very unobtrusive; and the attachment of Judaizing converts to the seventh day, on the grounds of Mosaic institution, not at all in competition among them with the gospel rest of the first day. I see the Bishop of Calcutta has remarks much to the same effect.

Were it even true that the New Testament is silent about an actual observance of the first day, yet this would only leave the question where it does the original Sabbath question, on the same hypothesis. I hope, however, to prove that it is very remote indeed from the fact.

Whether or not the Sabbatarian impair the principle of the Sabbath by honouring an ordinance prescribed under the covenant of nature, and embodying its essence, whilst rejecting all in a holy rest that is peculiar to the

gospel, and concentrates in itself all its truth ; I am not called here to decide. But, it is a position not to be taken without a most scrupulous regard to the mind of God.

The apostles were not at all likely to "secularize the seventh day," whilst the law remained, on the same principle which led them to join in the worship of the Jews ; and perhaps not even after their separation from that people, by the order of St. Paul. (Burnside. p. 130, 133.) Nor is it, generally, an object of the sacred narratives to record the secular engagements of the apostles, or primitive church. No argument of any force, therefore, arises in this.

The Jew was quite alive to the *general* statement among the Gentiles, that the law was to pass away. (Acts vi. 14 ; xxi. 21 ; vii. ; x. 28 ; xi. 2, 3.) The foreign residents, therefore, sent special reports of it to Jerusalem. And these were forwarded, it seems, both after the decree of the council at Jerusalem ; and after the apostle Paul's decided measures of separation from the seventh day Sabbath worship ; first, perhaps, at Corinth, and finally at Ephesus, altogether. These complaints do not specify an observance of the first day as holy ; but, as directed against a proclaimed abolition of "the law," so, they must include the Jewish Sabbath, whilst so grave a question as the merit of rival days was precluded by the quiet observance of the first day ; and its comparatively recent observance, as exclusively holy, by the church. Otherwise, it might have obtained equally prominent notice with circumcision. (Acts xv. 1.)

Circumcision, and the seventh day sabbath, stood on totally different grounds. The one was accidentally, if

at all, connected with the new covenant ; and through the Jew when converted to the gospel, and restored to his land. It entered with Abraham and his seed, as “ a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, being uncircumcised.” As he was already partaker of the covenant of grace, the rite was evidently a ceremonial adjunct, and not at all of its essence ; but, running into that which was immutable in all its parts, it received the common mark as *everlasting* ; and was already the pledge of the covenant of an everlasting inheritance. (Gen. xvii. 7, 13 ; Gal. iii. 14—16.)

But, the sabbath was of the old covenant, and partook of its essential nature, as *immutable* in all its principles and obligations ; not one jot, nor tittle, of which was to pass away. It was partially and peculiarly alone of the law, in the temporary adaptation of this to the Mosaic system. (John vii. 22, 23.) I cannot see but that equal deference was yielded to Jewish prejudice both as to *circumcision* and the sabbath ; too much, indeed, to the general body of Mosaic institutions by Jewish converts, and by Peter and Barnabas ; for, St. Paul says, “ Peter was to be blamed.” And will not these things sufficiently account for the difference, if any there be, in the deference paid by St. Paul to the Jewish sabbath, and to the rite of circumcision ; besides the fact, that the sabbath presented occasions of access to the body of that people constantly recurring, and not the other. (Burnside, pp. 145—147.)

I cannot think the interpretation of our Lord’s command to the paralytic correct, which would assign *its intent as only, or chiefly, to dispense with a positive precept, relating to the sabbath* ; and in order to assert His proper Deity. It was to show, that its moral and

immutable nature was involved in *the mercy* of the prescription to man and beast. It was also to prove, in the reality and origin of the cure, His own claims as that Prophet who should arise among them, whom they were to hear in all things. And who, as Lord of the sabbath, and Head of man, authoritatively proclaimed power to define the nature and design of its institution, that "it was lawful to do well on the sabbath days." (Matt. xii. 12.) It might be, likewise, anticipatory evidence of His right and power as "the second Man, who is the Lord from heaven," "the quickening Spirit" in all His seed, not only to define its nature, but apply its inherent *mercy* as a pledge and assurance of restoration, not of a paralyzed individual alone but of the whole body of the redeemed, from all the penal consequences of sin, on the soul and body. He knew its comprehensive design! Restored its purity! Secured its sanctity! Perpetuated its observance! Nor is it by any means true that such acts *were* esteemed unlawful, from their conduct even to their beasts. Neither was it so *in fact* but with these hypocrites; who magnified *the lesser matters of the law*, so as to disparage its more weighty points. For, is it not plain, that both the impotent man and his bed must have been carried previously to the pool where the sufferer was cured? And they must have been removed in the same way had not this miracle been wrought. Nay, as Bishop Wilson observes, "this act of the paralytic was part of the miracle of Jesus."

The correct view of our Lord's doctrine as to the sabbath is irrefragably established in Bishop Wilson's third sermon on the sabbath. Eleven separate occasions are adduced by him, in which the doctrine and spirit of

Jesus as to that institution are considered :—Luke iv. 16—22 ; John v. 5, *ad fin* ; Mark vi. 1—6 ; Luke xiii. 10—17 : Luke iv. 31—37 ; Luke vi. 1—5 ; John vii. 21, *ad fin* ; Luke xiv. 1—6 : Luke iv. 38—41 ; Matt. xii. 9—21 ; John ix. 1, *ad fin*.

This is his conclusion. “*All our Lord’s reasonings suppose the continuance of the day of rest in its essential moral obligations upon man.*” (P. 68.)

“Why regulate, why amend, why modify, the false usages, if all was about to be abolished ?” &c.

Matt. v. 17. “Think not that I am come to destroy the law,” &c. “Where by *law* must be understood the *moral* law ; for, He was thought to be a transgressor of that, and, especially, of this command (the 4th), in it, (for that sermon of His cometh in in order after His being challenged for breach of the sabbath, John v. 10,) and His scope is to wipe off that imputation ; and how ? By showing that He still presseth the moral law, even beyond what the Pharisees did.” (Durham, Fourth Commandment, p. 196. A.D. 1675.)

“It was the moral law, especially, the Pharisees corrupted, and whereof He undertaketh the vindication, and it is holiness in obedience to that which He presseth as necessary beyond what the Scribes and Pharisees did ; and, indeed, it was in that law that they failed mainly, and not in the ceremonial law. The offence and mistake that Christ is to pre-occupy and rectify it among His hearers, requireth this : for, many of them fancied that by the Messiah, there should be a relaxation of the duties of holiness called for in the moral law ; and, therefore, saith He, think not so : now a relaxation of some other laws might have been thought of warrantably. It is such a law whereof to teach the abrogation at any time

is sinful and pernicious ; therefore, it is certainly the moral law." "He speaketh of the law by way of eminency, (meaning, no doubt, the Decalogue.) He speaketh alike of all its commandments, even of the least of them, and so of this." (Durham.)

When St. Paul wrote to churches where clear and simple views of the gospel were to be enforced, to disabuse their minds of erroneous and legal corruptions, we find him rigid and inflexible, as we have seen him before conscientious and pliant. "But now, after that ye have known God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements ?" &c. "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. Behold, I, Paul, say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." (Gal. iv. 9—11 ; v. 2, 3, 4.)

And so the apostolical decree of the council denounced the preaching which affirmed, "ye must be circumcised, as troubling the church with words, subverting souls." Burnside has made observations to the same effect on these passages ; but we do not arrive at the same conclusion (pp. 135, 136.)

The Judaizing spirit, confounding the law and the gospel, had made deep inroads into the Galatian church. We find the greatest care, therefore, to distinguish and explain the covenants of nature and of grace ; and the strongest statements of the impossibility of uniting one to the other. (Acts xv. ; xvi. 4, 5 ; Gal. ii. 3, 14.) He denominates, therefore, every adulterated system, "another gospel, which is not another ;" or, a perverted gospel of Christ. And he denounces an awful curse of God on all who would promulgate any spurious system of Moses and Christ. (i. 6—8 ; v. 12.)

And is not this an answer to the argument founded

on the practice of circumcision for forty years after the resurrection among Christian converts? The observances condemned both in the Romans and Colossians are plainly Mosaical; arising, in some cases, in weakness of faith; but in others, in unbelief. (Rom. xiv. 1, 13—16; xv. 1, 2, 8, 3, 5, 6; xvi. 18—20; Gal. iii. 10, 11.) The *days* named are points only, as it will be seen, of an extensive subject pervading the whole of St. Paul's epistles, and one embarrassing to the whole church. And if the first day *were* observed as holy, yet his observations remain in all their force on the subject really before his mind. This was to shew that the gospel comprised all that was essential truth in the law; whilst it perfected, and superseded that entire system. Resort to the law imputed *imperfection* to the gospel—a system founded in, and displaying all the perfections of God; and it involved the deepest affront to His majesty. There is a plain reason why Gentiles might *object to sanctification of the seventh day*, even if they had complied with its observance when proselytes under the law. Controversy about these things, and controversy there undoubtedly was, might arise in the Judaizing spirit which would retain exclusively, or conjointly, the seventh day Sabbath of Moses. From his epistle to Ephesus it appears the contest had been so embittered, that adverse parties had attached opprobrious epithets one to another, and in a downright sectarian spirit, “that they might glory in their flesh;” “who are called uncircumcision, by that which is called circumcision in the flesh, made with hands.” And how does the Holy Spirit brand these Judaizers, and the tendency of their principles, and contentions about “the law,” the fables, endless genealogies, and trifles of that day, with the strongest terms of repro-

bation; as if "it happened to them according to the true proverb" quoted by St. Peter, "The dog is turned," &c. "Beware of dogs, beware of evil-workers, beware of the concision!" A striking assimilation of their opinions, in the mind of the Spirit, to those of the priests of Baal in the days of Elijah, who were of the concision indeed. (1 Kings, xviii. 27, 28.) Tearing their own bodies as these Judaizers would have torn the seamless garment of Christ, to insert old patches taken from the worn-out vestments of Moses! "For we are the circumcision," &c. (Phil. iii. 2, 3; 1 Tim. i. 3—9, 18—20; 2 Pet. ii. 21, 22; Burns p. 155, note; Gal. vi. 12, 13; Eph. ii. 14, 15.)

And, it is observable, that this occurred in the church where, as we shall see, the very first decided step was taken, and a separation from the Jews in public worship on the seventh day prescribed; and where, subsequently, rivals in apostolical power and commission arose.

If the question really at issue in those primitive times of the church were, whether or not the Mosaic law should be maintained under the gospel, which it will be necessary to consider,—then this controversy surely comprehended the Mosaic Sabbath. (Acts xix, 8—10; Rev. ii. 2.) If this be so, whatever its legal peculiarity, it disappeared with the Mosaic institutions. Original prescription of a day of rest to all; recognition of this at Sin, and an ordination of it to Israel at Sinai notwithstanding, implicate a legal peculiarity in their Sabbath. And, hence, it was appointed as their covenant sign. The principle of St. Paul's argument as to "the promise of the covenant confirmed before of God in Christ," and remaining in force, notwithstanding a disruption of the subsequent covenant ratified at Sinai,

applies equally to the original Sabbath, notwithstanding an abolition of the Sinaitic prescription. (Gal. iii. 17.)

A careful perusal of St. Paul's epistles will quickly show that it was a leading point, never absent from his mind, to oppose the prevailing tendency to adulterate gospel truth with mixtures of the law; and which was, in fact, to fall back on the covenant of nature, making void the covenant of grace.

And is this surprising, if it be the very germ of popery, "the mystery of iniquity that already worked?" (2 Thes. ii. 7.) A pervading feature in the Roman Catholic Church is, the Jewish perversions of the law in doctrine, a superstitious adoption of legal ceremonies in their rites, vestments, &c., and degradation of the Scriptures through their vain traditions. The want of correspondence between our church and that of Moses, in its various rites, &c., was indeed the prominent justification of an eminent modern seceder, happily returned, however, to her bosom. (Rev. Mr. S—p.) A brief consideration of this will show how futile the objections to our day of rest, deduced from St. Paul's epistles, are in truth.

What can be more forcible than the general declaration in his epistle to Rome, and to which subsequent mention of "doubtful disputations" must be referred. "Know ye not brethren," &c. (Rom. vii. 1—4; xiv. 1—23; xv.; xvi. 17—20.)

The Epistles to Corinth, read with a regard to this topic, abound in appropriate notices of the subject. (1 Cor. i. 11—24; ii. 6—10; iii., and *passim*, in both.)

The forcible observations in the Galatians have been mentioned before. All erroneous additions to the gospel are declared to be "a building again of that which had been destroyed." This may, possibly, throw some light

on the not difficult, but disputed, passage in the 3rd chapter of the first epistle. (1 Cor. iii. 12—15 ; Gal. ii. 11—21 ; 1 Cor. iii. 10—18.)

The same topic is prominent in his epistle to the Ephesians. (ii. 8—22 ; iv. 1—13, 14—16.) It was here the apostle laboured so long and effectually ; and where he first established an exclusive and public observance of the first day as holy.

In his Epistle to Philippi, this subject meets us again. The Jews had not any established synagogue there as at Thessalonica. From the circumstance of the disciples meeting “out of the city, where prayer was wont to be made,” and the attendance of St. Paul with the converts, some very groundless and untenable conclusions have been drawn. (Acts xvi. 13, 16 ; xvii. 1, 2 ; xviii. 4.) What is said, surely, *cannot be chiefly, or altogether, applied to the Christian converts.* (Acts xvi. 13.) For, it is evident that Lydia was either a Jewess, or a proselyte to the law ; as she “worshipped God.” (Verses 12, 14.) “Philippi was a chief city, and a colony.” “The Lord opened her heart” under the preaching of St. Paul there.

We have an instance in the 17th of Acts, of the apostle pursuing “his manner” on the Jewish sabbath in a purely missionary spirit. (Verses 1—6.) In the same chapter, there is an illustration both of the same kind, and of his simple attendance as one of the Jewish nation. (Ver. 16, 17.) And it is well observed by Perkins, that if he abstained occasionally from preaching Jesus in the synagogues, he might, on the like ground, forbear for a time to proclaim an abolition of the seventh day ; separation from the Jews’ worship on this day ; and substitution of the first day as holy. (xviii. 4 ; xvii. 2.)

This is not a proof, therefore, of a Christian observance of the seventh day, except on the reasons already named.

Whilst this meeting at Philippi is magnified by Sabatarians into proof of an exclusive seventh-day worship by Christians, the meeting at Troas on the first day for public worship, is to be regarded as of no meaning whatever! "The sabbath in the New Testament always signifies the seventh day, the observance of which the Judaizing teachers wanted to impose on the Gentile converts; and 'the Lord's day,' not the *sabbath*, is the scriptural term for this day of sacred rest." (See Scott's Commentary on Colossians.) (ii. 16, 17.)

But it was at Ephesus, and not long subsequent to the events to which I have just referred, that *St. Paul separated the Christians from all participation of worship with the Jews*: and, therefore, from all worship on this day; unless separate Christian worship could be proved on the seventh day.

A beginning of the same kind had, it appears, been made at Antioch. (Acts xiii. 42—46.) And it seems that he bore patiently with the Jews for a whole year previous to this decisive measure. (xix. 10; xx. 31.) He had seen, doubtless, in the general state of the church calling for the apostolical decree; in his contest with Peter at Antioch, and with the foreign Jewish residents everywhere; that the season of expediency had passed away. The apostle's mind had been, evidently, tending towards this decision for some time. (xviii. 6.) Nor can I find a single instance, after the measure taken at Ephesus, of his resort to the synagogue for any purpose whatever.

It was subsequent to this, and after his residence at

Ephesus for "three years," and a second visit to Philippi and other places, where his first introduction of the gospel is recorded, that the narrative of a public religious observance of the *first day* at Troas was written. (Acts xx. 31.) And it must have been, most probably, subsequent to these events that he wrote his epistles, where an observance of "a holy day, of the new moon, and of the sabbath," are named in plain consistency with this leading topic of Judaizing tendencies, so troublesome and dangerous to the "simplicity that is in Christ," and reprobated by him in such strong terms. Thus in writing his first epistle to Corinth, he mentions both the marked success of his work at Ephesus, and the serious opposition offered to its progress; "a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries." (1 Cor. xvi. 9.) Considering this, and the fact that in leaving Ephesus he carried with him, as it appears from the worship conducted by him at Troas, the observance prevalent in that church on the first day, any other view of those expressions would place his practice in open contradiction to his epistles, if the first day were included in the observances condemned there. From the provision of a large room, properly fitted for a public service, the ready convention of the body, considerable in its numbers, and the natural manner of speaking about this meeting, precisely as of ordinary occurrence,—it would appear that the first day's worship had been already established at Troas, in the interval between this and his first visit, when "a door was opened unto him of the Lord." (2 Cor. ii. 12.)

Although the Jews at Philippi were not regularly established as a religious body, yet, it is evident that

they were actuated by the most bigoted and intolerant spirit ; the very natural attendant on a body of worldlings struggling for influence and power. (Acts xvi. 16, 24.) And, hence arose the deliberation of St. Paul as to the damsel possessed by an evil spirit, and his care to avoid the dangerous notoriety of her cure, though he "was grieved" at the Satanic subtlety in which testimony was given to his divine authority and mission. Accordingly, her dispossession terminated in scourges, incarceration, and exile, when his alternative was necessarily taken. However, the same subject is plainly borne in mind through this epistle. (Phil. i. 27—30 ; ii. 3, 14, 15, 21 ; iii. 1—16.)

We see it again, and more prominently, in his epistle to Colosse, and the super-added danger of unsanctified science, "philosophy, and vain deceit," as well as mixtures of the law.

He denominates these Judaical errors as "after the rudiments of the world;" because the Mosaical institutions were an adaptation of the law of nature; and, therefore, of "the rudiments of the world." These deceptive adulterations were "after Moses, and not after Christ." Some of these are then enumerated; the Jewish Sabbath with the rest. The Sabbatarians, of course, deny this; because, they say, "It never was a shadow." (Burnside, p. 118.) But it partook of the general nature of that system. It was in origin a *natural* ordinance, engrafted upon that dispensation. It was their *covenant sign*; and what is this but the *shadow* of what was signified? And, surely, the Mosaic *signs* are all carried forward into gospel *signification*. Was it not, indeed, in an important sense, ever a shadow, and, like the Jewish Sabbath, ever something

more than a shadow? (See page 268, Jewish "*typos factos*," &c.)

It is difficult to be conceived of "converted Jews, after the dispersion of their nation, maintaining observance of a seventh day Sabbath as peculiar to a Christian body," had not the Gentile church observed another day. (Mod. Sabb. Ex., p. 134—136; Burnside, chap. iii.)

And if conscience alone were to determine the right or wrong of observing a day to the Lord, or not; and if St. Paul included the seventh day in this rule; how can it retain its sacred character under the gospel? A distinction must exist between observances of moral and immutable obligation, and those which were binding under peculiar circumstances alone, for such a rule to be applied. A heretic might, otherwise, plead conscientious scruples against the divine prescriptions. (Col. ii. 8—17; Gal. v. 2, 3—7.)

The Thessalonian church appears to have escaped these seductions; which is the more remarkable when we recollect the bigotry of the resident Jews. The Apostle mentions "ordinances" *verbally* instituted by him in that church. (2 Thes. ii. 15.) But his vivid impressions of the danger of those subtle errors are apparent: "lest by any means *the tempter* have tempted *you*, and our labour be in vain." (1 Thes. iii. 5; Acts xvi. 1, 5—10; xvii. 10—14.)

It may be observed how the clear and simple views of gospel truth in this church appear to have drawn out the Apostle to speak of this wide-spreading infection in terms predictive of its ultimate results; increasing, like all evil, "to more ungodliness," so as ultimately to enthrone the Man of Sin in the temple of God! These; his glowing description of that wicked

one, the head of anti-christian apostacy; with the time and mode of the final destruction of this last form of idolatrous delusion in the church; "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels:" these remind us of the more minute prophetic descriptions of the same false system in the book of Revelation. (1 Thes. iv; 2 Thes. i. 7—10; ii; Rev. xiii, xix.)

The same ground of apprehension, and the like warnings, are palpable in the epistles to Timothy and Titus. And it is observable in them how rapid had been the transition from those Jewish fables, endless genealogies, and "perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds," about the law in those days, to the very depths of heretical delusion, even to their denial of the resurrection itself. The same things are passing before our own eyes. Men are getting weary of the plain and simple food of God's truth. And secular influence does not follow as quickly as worldly men desire! The ancient spirit of Rome is clearly struggling for the mastery over private judgment, and essaying to accomplish by rampant majorities, (contemplating, perhaps, her old and more violent weapons of warfare,) that which cannot be established on the arena of fair, free, rational, and scriptural discussion. Vain is the effort, and flimsy the disguise, which would cover with a veil of spiritual objects the really temporal and ambitious designs which have ever characterized that unscrupulous community. It is not impossible that we may behold, even now, the commencement of that intermeddling struggle predicted, which will rouse among her ten horns the spirit to proscribe, punish, and extinguish her, as a common and intolerable nuisance to the nations. (Rev. xvii. 15, 16.)

It is plain, then, that this grand danger of a legal

spirit desiring a retention of what Christ had wholly set aside, was never absent from the mind of the Gentile Apostle. The topic needs not to be pursued further. His observations, evidently, apply to observances of Mosaic institution. It is not to be readily understood nor believed, that the Apostle would warn men against being led into observances of "meats, drinks, a holy day, the new moon, and the Sabbaths;" *i.e.*, against any mixture of the law with the gospel; and would himself include any gospel institution, or, that he could have it in mind at all, if, as they say, it did not in fact exist when he was speaking of those defunct prescriptions of the law. "These are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." (Col. ii. 16, 17.)

Daily resort to the temple at first does not shew an observance of the seventh day as holy. And yet this appears to be much depended on by Sabbatariauns. It proves too much. For it merges all distinctions of days, which is an element undeniably in the original institution. Besides, it would equally prove the holy observance of *the first day*. But it does indeed effect this. In an abolition of all distinction of days, it virtually repudiates *the seventh* and every other day as holy.

Community of property never existed, so far as we are informed, beyond the confines of Judea, nor for any long period even there, as the foreign contributions transmitted to Jerusalem prove. (Acts ii. 42—46; xi. 28—35; 2 Thess. iii. 10—12; Burnside p. 334.) Its cessation would necessarily determine the temporary custom of daily meetings. St. Paul's injunction to separate a portion of each person's weekly earnings for the support of the poor would have been useless, surely, had all things been then possessed in common. (verse 46.)

The "breaking of bread," spoken of in the second of Acts, was, in my opinion, a *religious act*. (See Guyse's Commentary.) For the other things named are of this nature. The same expressions are applied elsewhere to the Lord's Supper. (Acts xx ; 1 Cor. x. 16.) The forty-second verse of the second chapter of Acts recites the chief parts of public worship, in connection with this "breaking of bread." The forty-sixth verse, where this is also mentioned, relates to *the place* of this celebration ; to distinguish it from the place of the daily resort, or, "the temple," named in the foregoing clause. And thus the marginal reading is "at home," where alone this peculiar act of worship could be safely maintained ; whilst nothing was to be feared from a devout participation in the public ordinances of the law. (Acts i. 13, 14.) This appears to be the natural and correct interpretation of the *κατ'οικον* and *κατ'ερον*. (xv. 12, 21, 25, 42 ; xviii. 18 ; xix. 8—10 ; i. 14—26.) Their peculiar, united public worship is expressly recorded as conducted in *an upper room*. The same expressions recur in the twentieth chapter, in undeniable connection with public worship. The phrasology of the second chapter is observable ; "they were all with one accord in one place," *i.e.*, on *the first day*. Then "the promise of the Father" was fulfilled. It was not in *expectation* of this that they were "assembled together with one accord," for no definite time of its fulfilment had been specified by Jesus. (Vid. p. 287.) His expressions were, "not many days hence." If it were to keep the feast of first-fruits, so far as they could in safety from the Jews, yet, their assembly by common consent, and its issue on the first day, both indicate the substantial truth of that Mosaic ordinance, and sanctify the day of its fulfilment to the gospel

church. In one place these expressions are applied, indeed, to an ordinary meal ; but this is where no public worship can be inferred from the context ; and cannot disturb the general conclusion drawn from so many, and weighty considerations. (Luke xxiv. 30.)

I now proceed to the narrative of the meeting at Troas, which is treated by Burnside as “of no significance whatever ;” whilst “The Modern Sabbath Examined” broadly affirms, that “there is no trace whatever of an observance of the first day as a holy Sabbath,” (p. 47,) and with what reason it will be presently seen.

It has been stated why St. Paul resorted to the Jewish synagogues on their Sabbath. (Acts xviii. 1—6 ; Acts xiv. 1 ; xvii. 2 ; Luke iv. 16.) Our Lord did the same thing, probably for the same reason, and because the period for substituting “another day” had not arrived. The decrees from Jerusalem, however, declaring the release of the Gentile converts from all obligation to the law, offered a fitting occasion for a beginning. After a visitation of various cities with the decrees, and for the gathering of Christian churches, and the failure of his efforts with the Jews at Corinth, he seems to have taken a decided step as to the day of holy rest among the Gentiles ; and finally to have abandoned his countrymen to their inveterate bigotry, and persecuting intolerance : “from henceforth I will go to the Gentiles.”

The reason for using the word *Sabbath* in the Acts is, that the Jewish Sabbath is intended. (Burnside, p. 209.) And if no conclusion, adverse to the religious observance of the *seventh day* in the times to which the narrative relates may be drawn, then, neither may there be deduced on the same ground, any unfavourable inference as to *the*

first day. For if it be attributed to its universal and undisputed authority in one case, so may it be said in the other; and account for what men would pass over as a very slight and obscure record.

The same author asserts, "there is not a tittle of evidence to support the conjecture that the Apostles attended at the synagogue merely as pursuing their missionary work among the Jews." (p. 139.)

What, then, did the Apostle mean when saying, "to the Jews became I as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews?" (Rom. xi. 13, 14; Acts ix. 15—20; xxvi. 20; xiii. 2.) His call and mission had respect from the first to the *Gentiles*: "I am the Apostle to the Gentiles." And hence, most probably, originated the alteration of his name. After dedication to his proper work he was called Saul no more.* So that his very first sermons after conversion were decidedly missionary sermons to Jews in the synagogues of Damascus. (Acts ix. 20—30.) For three years, and soon after his conversion, he devoted himself to his special vocation in obedience to God's directions. (xxii. 17—21; Gal. i. 16—18.) There is, indeed, surprising obliviousness both in this assertion and another of the same author, viz., "there were not any converted idolaters at Antioch." (Acts xi. 19—21; xv. 1—22.) After a short visit to Jerusalem, his labours were for fourteen years among the Gentiles. It was "his manner" to seek the good of Israel where he might in the synagogue on the Sabbath day, until this occurrence at Corinth, and the still more decided act at Ephesus soon after.

And it is possible that worship on the first day may be included in "the ordinances" verbal and written,

* See "Paralipomena," by Dr. Vale, p. 822.

which he says he delivered to that church where this open and public infraction of his previous "manner" on the Jewish Sabbath first occurred. (1 Cor. xi. 2.) And from this time he abstained wholly from this "manner," even on his address to his countrymen at Rome. (Acts xxxviii. 17—31.)

It is not at all surprising that opponents of a holy rest on "the Lord's Day" should desire to invalidate the strong evidence of the narrative of proceedings at *Troas*. (xx. 7—16.) Let the various facts, and inferences from them, as on the face of that narrative, be fairly and fully contrasted with the far-fetched argument of a *prolepsis* to disprove the prescription at the creation relied on by one author, and with the futile attempts to evade the natural conclusion in assertion that "it enjoins nothing" by another; and it will be seen how easily and readily we receive and persuade ourselves of what we wish to be true. That meeting proves, however, what *had* been *enjoined*, as will be presently seen. (Burnside, p. 213.)

The leading subject of the narrative arose in the questions recorded in the decrees narrated in the fifteenth chapter, which agitated the Gentile churches, and the determination of which was a main object of this special mission. (Acts xiv. 26—28; xv. N.B. ver. 19; xvi. 4.) This pervades the whole subsequent account. In the course of this general visitation the occurrences already noticed took place at Corinth. (Acts xv. 36.) After an unrelenting opposition of the Jews everywhere but at Berea, and this decision at Corinth, he recurred to his old practice at Ephesus on two occasions, persevering on the last occasion for the space of three months. (Acts xviii. 19; xix. 8, 9.) The disciples there were

only twelve ; and his effort was followed by the same disheartening result. He *then* finally and decidedly abstained from all deference to Jewish prejudices, and all compliances with the Mosaic Sabbath and institutions, although he yet allowed himself to be led into a fruitless effort to conciliate his countrymen by the church at Jerusalem.

From this moment God's special blessing crowned his labours at Ephesus, "so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks, so mightily grew the word of God, and prevailed." (10—20 ; xx. 31. Scott in loc.) "This continued by the space of two years." But his whole labours there occupied "three years."

The next thing recorded after his labours at Ephesus, and a short visitation of some Gentile churches, is an appointed visit to Troas, accompanied by brethren from *Berea, Thessalonica, Derbe, and Asia*, closed by the religious service on the first day, and of which our opponents speak in terms of such disparagement to the question at issue. Is it unreasonable to presume that the first day's observance prevailed in the churches by which these missionaries were sent forth ? (Acts xv. 40, 41 ; xx. 1—5, 6.) The last place which was visited by them before Troas was Philippi. Nothing whatever is said of their participation of the feast of unleavened bread at Philippi : and Paul's companions departed during that feast. Burnside believes that they had observed the seventh day Sabbath previously to the first day at Troas ; which is purely conjectural, and not, as will be seen, likely. (p. 232.) Were it otherwise, this would only confer additional importance on the transactions of the first day ; or

it might have been an occasional recurrence to his "manner," on the original grounds.

Nor was the meeting at Troas occasioned by the approaching departure of Paul; for it is too minute in detail of other and distinct facts to consist with such an object alone. Nor does it appear that they were so pressed for time that it could not have been held before or after the first day. The ship was evidently at their disposal, and the Apostle selected the more dilatory mode of travel by walking to Assos. The farewell meeting at Miletus is narrated in a very different way. (Acts xx. 17—38.) The "long preaching" at Troas, and the short affecting charge and concluding prayer at Miletus, are respectively appropriate to the separate objects of regular worship in one case, and of a final meeting to take leave in the other.

The place of meeting, "this upper chamber," was not their common abode, considering both their numbers and the fact of their coming together, evidently from various dwellings; and the whole of the objects detailed in the narrative. Indeed, a person who had never heard the practice of observing "the Lord's day" disputed, would read the seventh verse as a reference to the constant sanctification of the first day.

The chamber had been evidently furnished appropriately for such purposes, and duly prepared on this occasion without any special summons, as at Miletus. and, so far as appears in general concert, as of ordinary custom on the same day. The word "when" is merely idiomatic; nor do Griesbach and others admit the word "disciples," but substitute "ours," *i.e.*, our body, or the Christian church; which answers to the terms in the previous verse, "*we* sailed away," &c. And

this is carried forward into the seventh verse : “on the first day of the week, the disciples being gathered to break bread,” &c.

It is asserted, “a very few hours were occupied by this meeting at Troas.” Were this the fact, which appears to be the reverse from the narrative itself, yet, the day of its occurrence ; the purpose and conduct of the meeting—points plainly stated—exclusive attendance of disciples of Christ ; the ordinances of worship observed, figuratively represented by the principal act, (as Bloomfield observes, commemorative of the day,) and apparent conformity to the regular custom of the church ; are more to the question at issue than the space of time consumed. Besides, to say nothing of the necessity which temporal wants might impose, especially where secular callings were exercised among Jews ; prudence, remembering the “many adversaries ;” recent establishment of an exclusive assembly for worship on a different day to that of the Jews ; *might* prescribe a rather late hour of meeting, as appears to have been the practice from the resurrection. In Judea the Christians would necessarily rest from secular avocations on the seventh day with the body of that people. Nor could they, were there not any temporal hindrance, keep the first day as a holy rest among that people as an entire day. At the very entrance on that journey which brought the Apostle and his friends to Troas, he had been in danger from the sanguinary hostility of the Jews in Greece. (Acts xx. 3.) I say nothing of the private and domestic duties which enter into right observance of a day of holy rest. It was not, perhaps, zeal alone that led the Apostle to warn and teach the Ephesian church in the “night” as well as the “day.”

The divine sanction was given to this meeting in the miracle performed. I call this an "extraordinary act" on this day, not deprived of its character in the least by an occurrence of extraordinary acts on other days. And especially may this be said when these are disconnected from the religious worship of the Christian body; and from an event on *the day* of this worship, which gave its place to the corner-stone of the gospel church; and when no question exists as to the sanctity of those other days. (Burnside pp. 207, 210; Mod. Sabb. Exam.; Burnside p. 210 and 177.) Neither is it to be conceded to mere assertion that "this meeting at Troas would never have been heard of but for the miracle;" when no man can say that the miracle itself would have been displayed but for the meeting. "Paul, it is said, was long preaching;" "they talked a long while, even till break of day." (Ver. 9—11)

It does not appear that St. Paul and his friends paid any religious respect whatever to the Sabbath on the day before. I cannot imagine on what grounds an opposite opinion could be entertained by Burnside. Their worship began on "The Lord's day;" closed with the holy communion, and edifying fellowship protracted until the dawn of Monday; or, from about seven at night until about five in the morning. This *night* must have been part of "the seven days." (Verse 6.) "For he must otherwise have remained a night longer, or above seven days, because part of another day." (Perkins.) The room was large, for "many lights" were needful. The congregation was crowded, or Eutychus would scarcely have taken a place of such danger. With the data supplied in the narrative we may form the following Table:—

Tracing the sojourn of St. Paul backward it appears, as Monday was one of the "seven days," that they arrived at Troas on *Tuesday* (xx. 6) ; abode there from *Tuesday* to *Monday* at dawn of day ; passed unobserved *Saturday*, the seventh day Sabbath ; observed the *Sunday*, or first day, as holy.

Reckoning the five days' voyage from Philippi to Troas backward, their departure from Philippi was on the *Friday*.

So that instead of observing the Sabbath there, as *Burnside* supposes, before their departure, they were that day on their voyage to Troas. (Ch. iii. 232.)

That the Apostles and Christians at Troas observed as holy both the seventh and first days, is both incredible in itself, and unsupported by testimony direct, or indirect, in the narrative of the transactions there.

The object of St. Paul at Troas was two-fold, *viz.*, to deliver "the decrees," and "to preach Christ's gospel" there (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13) ; and where, about two years before, at his first visit, it afterwards appeared that "a door was opened unto him of the Lord as at Ephesus." (Acts xvi. 6—11.) And we have here the minute details of their proceedings on this second visit, quite as minute as those which record an institution of the Lord's Supper. And if St. Paul took part in the first day's holy worship narrated here, then, unless it could be shown that public worship among Christians had ceased, we have an *implied prescription* obeyed here under the direction and sanction of the Holy Ghost.

I shall not dwell on the fact that this distinguished body of missionaries abode seven days at Tyre, and most probably for the same purpose of worship as at

Troas ; for the delay is ascribed to their finding disciples there. Here again, as at Assos, the ship awaited their pleasure, which indicates control over it and their own movements, and absence of any secular necessity to select the particular day at Troas or Tyre.

The question of the Mosaic Sabbath is naturally unnoticed in the Apostolical decree.

For the Apostle, and Christians in general, doubtless, had hitherto yielded to it all possible respect. Its exclusive or paramount claim would necessarily arise, if at all, both in St. Paul's change of "manner" as to the Mosaic, and his adherence to the gospel institution alone. Nor was it, indeed, necessary ; for the exceptions specified in the decree left the claims of the seventh day Sabbath to participate of the fate pronounced on "the law." The *Sabbath* is not particularized, as it was not alone of the law ; nor some of the other things named : but it preceded them all, and had not been, like circumcision and the other things, perhaps, brought into question by the objection of Christians to partake in its observance. (Acts xv. 1, 28, 29.)

Subsequent to the decided step at Ephesus, and the public worship at Troas on the first day, receiving notoriety, doubtless, both from the attendant fatality, and miracle of raising the youth to life again ; the wide extension of the gospel in Greece and Asia ; we *do* find formal and serious complaints against the Apostle for insisting on the total abrogation of the law among the converted Jewish residents abroad, and among the Gentiles. (xxi. 20—24.) And this terminated in St. Paul's expulsion from Jerusalem, and his committal to the bar of Cæsar at Rome. The whole question of "the law," in relation to the gospel, would receive the sharpest sting

in this Apostolical separation from worship on the seventh day, and open observance of "another day" in its stead. For, as the law was their covenant, and its Sabbath their covenant sign, so release from the one would be release from the other. Substitution of "another day" as holy would imply an entrance of a new covenant, and this with the Gentiles. (Acts xi. 18.) His inflexible maintenance of the gospel, as fulfilling and superseding the law, appears to have offered, in Providence, the most appropriate occasion to the Gentile Apostle for sealing his testimony to Jesus in this approach towards the end of his labours ; for little is certainly known of them afterwards.

The complaint against St. Paul does not, evidently, *respect moral duties* in general ; about which we do not know of any prevailing difference of mind. Nor can it be expected that "both negative and positive prescriptions would be mixed in the same decree." Neither would it be needful to enjoin an observance of the first day as holy, were this voluntarily sanctified already ; and this, too, for reasons deeply laid in the foundation of the world and church, boldly asserted in the practice of St. Paul, and perpetuated without interruption to this day.

Only in one sense can it be said that *supercession of the Decalogue is implicated in this Apostolical decree, i.e.*, so far as this embodied the worship and moral perfection of the covenant of nature, in its adaptation to that church. (Deut. xiii. 3 ; Matt. xxii. 36—40 ; Exod. xxi. 24 ; Gal. iii. 9—18.)

It is so far, then, from being "arbitrary to attach importance to this meeting at Troas," that fair interpretation imparts to it the greatest weight. And it appears,

moreover, consistent with the spirit of St. Paul's general direction, "those things which ye have both learned, and received, and *seen* in me, do : and the God of peace shall be with you." (Phil. iv. 9.) And this may meet the objection against "the authority attached to scriptural examples." How, indeed, can they be otherwise than authoritative in men acting under the plenary inspiration of the Holy Ghost ? (1 Cor. x. 1—12 ; Heb. xi.)

If it do not follow that "the ancients sacrificed without divine authority from our not being informed of it," neither does it follow that this palpably religious meeting for worship on the first day was unauthorized by Apostolical precept, because there is not any formal statement of this fact. The principle involved in both facts is the same ; and both relate to the worship of God. But *we* have, in this case, not the bare fact alone, but the *originator* of this public and peculiar practice among the Gentiles ; the *leader* in an undeniable observance of worship, an illustration in the practice of the church of our Lord's object in meeting it on this day ; and what is of vital importance, this leader acting under inspiration as the Gentile Apostle, teacher, and guide ! A virtual prescription by the Holy Ghost ! True it is that the law of sacrifice was subsequently instituted by God ; and it is equally true that the prescription at Sinai was part of that system, in which all original institutions were adapted to the church for its temporary administration ; and where the basis of the fourth commandment is positively ascribed to an act of the Lord at the creation ; all of which Mosaic institutions were substantially transferred to that which is to remain, until what is both eternal and perfect shall come, "never to be moved." The *substance*, or "body," of "Sabbaths" is expressly

said to have been transferred to Christ. Were there not a holy gospel rest, where could we look for this *body*, or *substance*?

It is remarkable that when a prescription is adduced, without a direct record of observance, as it is alleged, it is asserted that this renders it virtually invalid, and calls for another interpretation. And into what importance is this exalted by one party? But where there is an undeniable record of observance, and not, as affirmed, a plain prescription, then this is pleaded by another party! It is the ancient misfortune! Where the ear and taste are not attuned, music has not a power to charm! (Matt. xi. 17.)

Why is it to be deemed "unnatural that the original law of the Sabbath should be embodied in the fourth commandment," which prescribes the day of holy rest to the Jews, any more than the natural, immutable, and original *law*, to the law of Moses; or the universal, original, and unchangeable covenant of works, to the peculiar and temporary covenant of the Jews? It is, surely, far more unreasonable to extract out of a code confessedly moral *one commandment*, and to say "this is *not* moral!" And when this prescription, too, relates to the worship of God; the grounds of which are so scrupulously laid in the preceding three! Which was proclaimed by the mouth of the Lord Himself, as well as the others! Enters into such specific details as to persons, time, and its essential nature, arising in an *act of God Himself*! Which is enforced by such solemn sanctions!

It may be deserving of consideration, indeed, whether or not the principle which is involved in this severance between what is approved and disapproved in the com-

mandments, does not resemble that which leads so many of professing Christians to separate the promises of the gospel from their conditions ; and which constitutes all the difference between faith and presumption.

1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2—"On the first day of the week," &c. In his first Epistle to Corinth St. Paul speaks of "ordinances," as he does to the Ephesians. And in these two churches, remarkably, the commencement was made of the first separation from the Jews, without any subsequent mention, or qualification of union in their worship. And as the object of that assembly at Troas was undeniably the public worship of God, and its leading ordinance, the Eucharist, is particularized, so an observance of this with "The Lord's Day," offers the suitable explanation.

It is evident from the context that his direction as to charitable contributions among the Corinthians relates to that day as the day of ordinary meeting in the church for public worship (1 Cor. xi. 2, 4) ; for their observance of these ordinances they are commended.

A common rule is implied in another chapter of that same epistle, as necessary to the peace and unity of the Church. (xiv. 33.)

The custom of "assembling," "coming together" for public worship, must be inferred from the next verse. (34.) A previous verse had implied also *uniformity* of public worship in the Gentile churches. (16.) In another, this assembly of the church "in one place" is recorded, and its objects, viz., "to eat the Lord's supper." This "one place" is contrasted by him with their private dwellings ; and it is called the "church of God," inclusive both of place and people. (xi. 22.)

In the whole context careful directions are given as

to God's public worship. Celebration of gospel "ordinances," the Lord's supper, prayer, preaching, exercise of extraordinary gifts, personal demeanour in the congregation, and the spirit inseparable from all religious observances acceptable to God, are all introduced. (xi, xii, xiii, xiv. 26, 27.) And it is stated, *positively*, in regard to all these details, that they were "the commandments of the Lord."

In the next chapter, having very comprehensively described the gospel as based on the resurrection of Jesus, the seal of His perfected work in the covenant of grace; and, having followed out his subject to the glorious consummation at the second advent, he proceeds to *this rule* for contributions towards the poor. (xvi, 1, 2.) Justin mentions this as existing in his day, A.D. 155; observed by Christians in their *first day's* worship and assembly together.

The force of this, as an insulated proof, is in its unbroken connection with the context; its incidental mention, so consistent with undisputed observance of the first day as a holy rest, and the natural inferences deducible from the rule. The general subject does not need any attempt to magnify minute points. And, it is plain to what an opposite error is to be ascribed, of representing "this certain day separated for charitable collections, as having no more significance in it as to the first-day question, than Friday, or any other day of the week." (Burnside p. 233.)

We may fairly contrast with this the disproportioned burthen so complacently reposed on such really trivial incidents as bare mention of the word "Sabbath," whilst the Mosaic law was in common exercise, and its Sabbath for temporary reasons, and respected in the practice of

Christians. Our subject is too strongly supported by the whole tenor of Scripture, to hazard an accusation of vain attempts to balance the cone on its apex.

Moreover, it is certain that matters of this description were *not* prescribed on the vague reasons suggested to account for this apostolical direction. The most scrupulous care was manifested at the very foundation of the gospel church, in *its* administration of temporal affairs. (Burnside pp. 182, 183, 184.) Faithful discharge of secular duties was sanctioned and secured by the most serious acts of devotion, and appeal to God for His acceptance, direction, and blessing. (Acts vi.)

This was, doubtless, a *common rule* to the whole church, from an asserted participation of other churches in this "order," and from the Apostle's general principle of action, elsewhere propounded to this same church. (1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 13.)

If it is not to be denied that this church, and all others, therefore, did "come together into one place to pray," to *break bread at the Lord's table*, &c., then, why, but that this was on the first day, and the duty unquestioned, did not the Apostle ordain this duty to be done *once in the week*? Although Holy Scripture be written in popular language, yet the Holy Spirit could not but speak in His own character, even as to the language in which truth was conveyed, as the Spirit of truth. In the works of man, the more minute the scrutiny of their component parts, the more glaring is their imperfection. It is the reverse, as to the works of God. Every person who has devoted a measure of attention to the language of holy writ, must be convinced of this *at the least*, that such a vigilant, sleepless, and over-ruling Providence has been exercised as to this

vehicle of God's truth, that no serious error could be introduced. And would it not be erroneous to express an ordinance as to this act in *definite*, that might be interpreted in *indefinite* terms?

And an answer is the more necessary to the question why this act should be prescribed to be done on a certain day, without any special significance whatever as to this day, even were the seventh-day Sabbath sanctified, as the Sabbatarians contend. This appears decisive against an exclusively holy observance, or, indeed, any holy observance of the seventh day.

When it is said, "there is no significance in this direction," it is forgotten how many peculiarities attach exclusively to *the first day*; and in connection with what the Lord Jesus denominates "the fulfilment of all righteousness;" and which, on so many, and, *in themselves*, trivial occasions and circumstances, He so scrupulously marked Scripture as fulfilled. Opponents have not shown as good a reason, or any tolerable reason whatever, to explain the Apostle's selection of this day for collection of alms by the church.

Such directions cannot be passed off as "insignificant," when the actors and historians were consulting the good of the *whole* church; writing for its final and complete instruction; and could always say of their prescriptions, marking with the most conscientious care those cases in which it was otherwise, that what seemed good to *them*, "seemed good also to the Holy Ghost." (Heb. i. 1; ii. 1; Acts xv. 28.)

As the seventh day, it is asserted, was thought fitter for a circumcision than the first day, which appears very equivocal as to the *reason* of the notion; to the Judaiser one thing, and to the simple-minded Christian,

possibly quite another ; so must it be presumed, that some cogent and *practical* reason existed for the prescription of that on a *special day*, which would be the same in principle if done on *any day*. Selection of the seventh day for this act, except it happened to be the eighth from the birth, would be an unwarrantable liberty taken with that ordinance. Were its origin owing to the desire of getting rid of a notion entertained by a father, and, perhaps, more ancient than his time, that the gospel Sabbath was prefigured by an appointment of this rite on the eighth day ; then an encouragement of that truly Jewish prejudice would be intelligible enough. I do not see, for my part, how anything could commend itself more to the Church, than the severance of money or of bread, to sustain *natural life*, on that day appropriated to distribution of “the unsearchable riches of Christ,” and of the bread of life to the souls of perishing sinners ; nor in more exact keeping, as an act of *mercy*, with our Lord’s explanation of the nature of the Sabbath ; nor with an observance embodying evangelically the gift of the true bread from heaven. However, this is not the only act which is ordained apostolically to be done on this special day. “In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.” (Scott in loc. ; Guyse, vide p. 321 ; 1 Cor. v. 4, 5.)

This meeting applied by the apostle to this end would be under the same infallible direction, and possessed of the same authority by the Holy Ghost, as when, in such cases, he acted himself. (1 Tim. i. 20.) For, it is not

only said "my spirit," but also, "the power of our Lord Jesus Christ," to sanction and enforce the proceedings. Poole presents for selection the double view of reference, either to the *authority* or *institution* of Christ for this gathering. (1 Cor. v. 7, 8.)

From the following context this "gathering together" appears to have been not special for this occasional purpose, but for their ordinary public worship, represented by an administration of the Lord's Supper, and which customarily administered every Lord's day, was the gospel "body," so to speak, or substance of that Mosaic institution, with its attendant ceremonies and sabbaths. We shall presently consider this in detail. The specialty in the case relates not to the *gathering*, but to this *application* of it for enforcing discipline by church censures, and other punishment of offenders. Nor would this be inconsistent with the fourth verse, taking the expressions, "when ye are gathered together" as parenthetical, and with the object of the day, were this "the Lord's day," which was merciful; "that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

The phrase, "when ye are gathered together," is that of the Lord Jesus, when promising "his presence wherever two or three are gathered together in his name." (Matt. xviii. 10—20.)

It is used also in Acts, as to the service at Troas. (xx. 7.) And the work of God is still carried on in the church chiefly by these means. (John vi. 29; Rom. x. 17.)

Worship on the "Lord's day," and administration of the communion of the body and blood of Christ, present a peculiar propriety in connection with the Mosaic *Pass-over feast*.

The Passover and Pentecostal feast was to be reckoned from the fourteenth day of the month Nisan. (Lev. xxiii. ; Matt. xxvi. 17.) The first day of the feast of unleavened bread was on the fifteenth day, which was the first holy convocation day of the feast. The second holy convocation day, or sabbath, was on the seventh day of this feast of unleavened bread.

From the morrow after the first sabbath, or holy convocation day, when the first-fruits of the first, or barley harvest, were presented, seven sabbaths, or forty nine days, were to be counted for the Pentecostal feast, which was to be on the day after, or on the *fiftieth* day. On this day, the first-fruits of the *second* or wheat harvest were solemnly presented to God. (Lev. xxiii. 5, 6, 7, 15, 16.)

On the fourteenth day, Israel's first-born were spared, and the Egyptians' first-born slain. On the fifteenth day, or first holy convocation day, their march out of Egypt began ; and on the second holy convocation day, they crossed the Red Sea. On the fiftieth day, the law was promulgated from Sinai. Twice did Israel observe the Passover in the wilderness, and a third time on crossing Jordan, and entering into their land of rest. And then continually, to the close of their dispensation. All this has been maintained in exact keeping under the gospel.

The following are the prominent appointments which are embodied in the holy rest of the Gospel, on "the Lord's day :"

I.—The killing of the Lamb on the fourteenth day, and participation of the Passover supper.

II.—The first holy convocation day on the fifteenth day.

III.—The presentation of the first-fruits of the first or barley harvest, (on the sixteenth day,) the day after the first holy convocation day.

IV.—The second holy convocation day, on the eighth day from the death of the Passover Lamb.

V.—The presentation of the first-fruits of the second, or wheat harvest, on the fiftieth day, or the day of Pentecost.

“The Jews had two kinds of types, *typos factos*, and *typos destinatos*; types made and applied, and types appointed and ordained of God, to shadow forth some notable thing: as the Paschal Lamb was *typus destinatus* (an ordained type,) of our Saviour Christ,—as they were not to break a bone of the Lamb,—so was it accordingly performed in Christ. They had also many types besides, which were not destined to signify any certain thing. Of such St. Paul speaketh. (1 Cor. x. 6—11.) So we say of the sabbath, *i.e.*, ours; that it is not *typus destinatus*; it is not instituted for any shadow, or signification, though it may be fitly *applied* to such “a use.” (Willett, Syn. Pap., p. 500, 501.) But the *reverse* is the truth of the Jewish Sabbath, which was a *shadow of things* to come, but the body is of Christ. (Col. ii. 17.)

Now, the *first* part of the type was fulfilled in the death of Christ on the fourteenth day, as “the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world,” and in an institution of the Lord’s Supper.

The *third*, in His resurrection and appearance with the fruits of His ministry, on the *first day of the week*, after His crucifixion, and “as the first-fruits of them that slept.”

The *fifth*, on the day of Pentecost; the fiftieth day of

the feast, and on the *first day* of the week; the day after the seventh Sabbath of the Passover feast. Then were the second harvest first-fruits gathered. On the same day, the fiftieth, the law had been promulgated from Mount Sinai. On this first day, "life and immortality were brought to light by the gospel," in the resurrection of Jesus. And on this day, the fiftieth and the first day, was sent forth "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," by the gift of the Holy Ghost. And thus the first act of Omnipotent energy was exercised in the natural creation, by the production of the element of light. So far, I think, a transference of the substantial truth of those Mosaic ceremonies to the gospel church cannot be disputed. It is only reasonable to look for a fulfilment of the other two, the *second* and *fourth* ordinance of that festival. And if this be substantiated, the gospel rest might be well designated by St. Paul, as concentrating in itself the main truth of the church of Christ. And I do not think that the whole Bible presents a more remarkable coincidence of Mosaic shadows, embodied in a gospel ordinance, than those which are comprised in this Sabbath of the Son of Man.

Scott, in his Commentary, whilst adopting the opinion that assigns the *fifteenth day* to the crucifixion of our Lord, yet acknowledges that "many expositors" think otherwise. (Matt. xxvi. 17, 20; Mark xiv. 12, 17, 27; Luke xxii. 1, 7, 14, 47, 48; John xviii. 3.) It appears to me *demonstrable* that Jesus both kept the Passover, and suffered as the real Lamb, on the *fourteenth day*. The determination of this will refute the conjecture of Burnside; for, no *proof* of his assertion is offered, *viz.*, that Pentecost did *not* fall on our first or Lord's Day. (See Introduction, p. 5., Arg. from Perkins.)

It is certain that the Passover when our Lord suffered began on the sixth day of the week, (our Thursday,) on the fourteenth Nisan, *at even*. This is, undeniably, ascertained by taking the *first day*, when our Lord rose, as the point of computation on *assured* ground. This was the *third day* from the crucifixion, and commenced at six o'clock on *Saturday* evening; the *second day*, at six on *Friday* evening; the *first* at six on *Thursday* evening, and which was also the fourteenth Nisan. (Mark xv. 25; Luke xxiii. 44; John xix. 14.) This was the *first day* of the Passover feast, when the Lamb was to be killed. The sacrifice of this Lamb was ordained to be "between the two evenings," (Exod. xii. 6. margin,) or between sun-decline and twilight. "There thou shalt sacrifice the Passover at even, at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt." (Deut. xvi. 6.) It has been assumed that this was when the sun had declined half way from the meridian. The Jews appear to have reckoned *two evenings*, one from the ninth hour to sunset; the other from sunset to twilight, or night-fall, when the stars begin to appear. As the fourteenth day set in, unquestionably, on Thursday evening at six o'clock, they must have esteemed the earlier evening, (really as a portion of the thirteenth,) as being part of the fourteenth day, on this special festival of the law.

But the twilight of Thursday evening, and that of Friday evening, or the *sunset* and *twilight* of Thursday, might meet the phraseology of the Mosaic ordinance; would harmonize with the history, with Exod. xii. 6; Deut. xvi. 6; and with the day of resurrection, reckoned as on the third day from the crucifixion, and on the first day of the week. Brown, in his Bible Dictionary, says,

"the Lamb was killed *between the two evenings*," i.e., about three o'clock in the afternoon, when the sun was half way declined (or between meridian and sunset): and about this time the evening sacrifice was offered." He says also, "that the sacred, if not the civil, year of the Jews began from the evening."

It is observable that the Mosaic and natural measures of time recognize the divisions of *night* and *day*, and make one night and morning *a day*; the natural day of twenty-four hours. Hence, the Hebrew compound, *evening-morning*. (See Hales' Chron., vol. i. p. 110, &c.)

Josephus places the Passover sacrifice at the same time as Brown. (John xii. 1—12; Scott on Exod. xii. 6.)

The duration of the Sabbath was prescribed *from even to even*: from one twilight to another. (Lev. xxiii. 32.) Their *day* closed, however, at sunset; whereas *twilight* would not be until the sun was depressed twelve degrees below the horizon. (Judges xiv. 18.)

The day of the *Passover* was precisely ordained; *the hour* of its sacrifice not with the same precision. It appears, therefore, unjustifiable so to determine this hour, where there is undeniable latitude of expression, as on this ground to remove *the day* where there is precision; making it the *fifteenth* instead of the *fourteenth*, as Scott has done. (See the quotation from Perkins, p. 244.)

In Deuteronomy the Passover sacrifice is, evidently, ordained to be first, at even, at *the going down of the sun*; and second, at the time of the departure out of Egypt. Now, the Lamb was killed in the evening of their exode; and their departure was actually between this and the morning twilight. (Exod. xii. 6, 18, 29—39.)

If the Passover sacrifice were about three o'clock in

the afternoon, then Moses must have reckoned the *fourteenth* day as commencing at that time.

Jesus was crucified somewhere between the *third* and *sixth* hours on *Friday* ; died about the *ninth* hour ; and was taken down about the *eleventh*. All occurred between *nine* o'clock in the morning and *five* in the evening. St. Luke says of this fourteenth day, or Passover, "when the hour was come, He sat down, and the twelve Apostles with Him." (xxii. 14.) This looks more like a definite, than an indefinite, time. But, it is expressed in popular phraseology. It was so far part of the feast, that not only was the Lamb killed, roasted, and eaten with bitter herbs, but with unleavened bread. (Exod. xii. 7, 15—18.) It was esteemed so as to be necessarily employed in *preparation* for a removal of all leaven out of their houses on the fifteenth day ; in keeping themselves from all ritual defilement ; and preparing for the sacrifices to be offered. (Guyse, on Matt. xxvi. 20., note ; John xviii. 28.) The Jews carefully distinguished between what might not be done on their solemn days, and on their Sabbath ; and we have an instance in their conduct of the proceedings against Jesus, and their refusal to enter into the judgment hall. (Lev. xxiii. 5—8.) Scott says, "any work except such as respected commerce, manufactures, agriculture, or menial services, was allowable." Moses says, generally, "servile work." Administration, therefore, of their judicial law, as in the case of Jesus Christ, was legitimate. Perhaps some idolatrous display at the Roman judgment seat might excite their scruples about entrance into the hall. When their seventh day Sabbath was at hand, the Jews shewed the different estimation in which it was held, compared with the day of preparation.

Our Lord's apprehension was certainly on the fourteenth day of Nisan, for the feast was evidently not begun : "but they said, *not* on the feast (day) lest there be an uproar of the people." (Mark xiv. 1, 2.) All was arranged to anticipate that day. Whatever was the precise time, it was evidently considered as the fourteenth day.

Our Lord's observance of this passover was plainly *late*, and when the fourteenth day had actually entered. Matthew says, "when the even was come, He sat down with the twelve." (xxvi. 20.) Mark, "in the evening He cometh with the twelve." (xiv. 17.) Luke, "when the hour was come." (xxii. 14.) John denominates the passover, "supper." He says, "It was night." (xiii. 2, 4, 30.)

The *two evenings* of the Jews, the first of which entered about the ninth hour or three o'clock, may explain the latitude implied in the phraseology of the Evangelists ; "about the third hour," "about the sixth hour."

The Greeks had likewise their Δειλη and Οψε. Matthew combines both ; οψις γενομενης, "when it was evening." (xiv. 15 ; Luke ix. 12. See Hales' Chron. vol. i., p. 110—117, where the whole subject of this elementary measure of time is discussed.)

In Mark xv. 25, it is said, "it was the third hour. and they crucified Him." St. John, in the authorized version, assigns "the sixth hour" to those events which immediately preceded the leading away of our Lord to suffer. An ancient copy has it, however, "the third hour," and this is generally received. But it might be within the compound quarter, *i.e.*, nine and twelve o'clock expressed by the last hour. And, carefully considered, does not Mark harmonize with this ? Are not his expressions "the third hour," reflective of those events

narrated in the preceding three verses; whilst the others, "and they crucified Him," relate merely to *the fact*, and not to the *precise hour*? Instantaneous succession of events is not always intended when, in Scripture, two things are consecutively named. The civil day of the Jews began with an appearance of the stars; and so did their Sabbath, continuing to the same nightfall again. Hence, Luke says of our Lord's interment, "and that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on," (xxiii. 54,) or began to dawn. Their eleventh hour was at sunset, as in the parable of the labourers, and their day comprised twelve hours. If it were at twilight on the fourteenth day that in general estimation it is said, "when the hour was come," it would seem that even the time prescribed for the Passover sacrifice intimated the dim and shadowy character of that dispensation. Perkins observes that the Jews had what he denominates "a compound hour," or a quarter of the day; to the whole of which the name of the last hour of *the quarter* was assigned. "The first quarter from the morning to the third hour, called the third hour," and so of the rest. He cites as instances Mark xv. 25; John xix. 14; Luke xxiii. 44. (P. 678, 679.)

Although Jesus observed this Passover on an entrance of the fourteenth day, yet it is not so plain that the Jews were engaged in the same way, but it is most likely. Whether or not it was observed by them at the same time, or about the time of His crucifixion, their hypocrisy was plain, in going out to apprehend Him in one case, and to Pilate for the removal of His body in the other; for no man was to stir from his place till the morning. (Exodus xii. 22.)

If they kept this Passover towards the *close* of the

day of crucifixion, there would appear a remarkable providence in the Saviour's observance correspondently with its *first institution*, that of the Jews, and our Lord's fulfilment of the type at the *termination* of this Mosaic ceremony; the cross of Calvary illustrating that typical emblem exhibited at the same moment on each Jewish hearth! The Gospel narratives of the Passover are evidently written in popular language, of which abbreviation is an ordinary characteristic. Thus, Matthew says, "now the first (day) of the feast of unleavened bread, the disciples came to Jesus, saying," &c. (xxvi. 17), *i.e.*, the day when the passover was to be killed, or the fourteenth, and not the fifteenth day, which was the first day of the feast. And Mark, therefore, thus explains the terms. (Mark xiv. 12.) Such was its popular designation; still, however, meaning the fourteenth and not the fifteenth day. Thus Luke says, "now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, called the Passover." Jesus partook of food before He left Bethany, and previous to sending two of His disciples to prepare the Passover Supper. (Matt. xxvi; Mark xiv. 3, 12, 17.) And how it can be supposed when our Lord intermingled a participation of the Mosaic and Gospel Passover *Supper*, on the fourteenth day, that no correspondence between them exists, I can neither understand nor believe. "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, let us keep the feast," says St. Paul. And what this feast is he makes plain; for, it is added, "not with old leaven," &c. (1 Cor. v. 7, 8.)

It is not to be denied, therefore, that evangelical truth was involved in this ceremonial ordinance of Moses, and that we possess this, both substantially and integrally, in the Gospel church. There is, therefore, significance in

all these acts of Jesus, both before His crucifixion and after His resurrection. And the Lord's observable and constant indications of the fulfilment of predictions and types of the Old Testament in Himself and the Gospel church, inculcate this lesson. His own observance of the Passover, and fulfilment of the type in His *death*, were, necessarily, in different parts of the day, but within the *fourteenth day*.

Another point prominent in the Mosaic feast of the Passover to be noticed is, the *first Holy Convocation day*, or Sabbath, which was on the fifteenth day of the month. This was the first day of the *feast of unleavened bread*, which lasted seven days, terminating, as it began, with a *second Holy Convocation day*. My present concern is with the first of these.

The fourteenth day entered with the Thursday evening, or sixth day of the week. Percy quotes Sir Isaac Newton's Chronology of our Lord's ministry as inclusive of *five* passovers; contrary to the more general computation which embraces only four. He copied the scheme from Bowyer's conjectures in his preface, p. xxxi. (See Percy's Key to the New Testament, p. 35—40.) This makes the fifth passover to begin on *Wednesday*, April 13; (John xi. 53—55;) in the consulship of Fabius Vitellius. But the day could not be *Wednesday*, as we have seen. There cannot be any doubt, from the computation based on *a fact revealed*, that our Lord rose on the first day of the week, which could only be the third day by the *fourteenth* day entering on the sixth day of the week, or between three o'clock and twilight on our so-called Thursday evening.

The difference of opinion on the duration of our Lord's ministry proves an uncertainty of its beginning; and

involves its end, therefore, in equal obscurity on the data which have been assumed.

In the year of our Lord's crucifixion this feast day entered on the *Friday evening* at six o'clock, extending to the same hour on *Saturday evening*, corresponding, of course, with their ordinary Sabbath; and constituting this Sabbath, as the Evangelists designate it, "a high day." (Lev. xxiii. 21; John xix. 31.) As at the old creation God made the heavens, and the earth, and all the host of them, in six days, and rested on the seventh, so Jesus exclaimed at the closing scene, "it is finished!" *Then* the law, as it was of Moses, ceased. "Ye are become dead to the law, by the body of Christ." (Rom. vii. 4.) This was the great end to which attention had been ever directed; and, hence, this exclamation of Jesus.

On this day, a "high day" of the Jews, their Sabbath and Convocation Day concurring, and doubly sanctified in their estimation, Jesus lay in the grave; and with Him, undeniably, the law; the Covenant, its sign consequently, or Sabbath; and with this, therefore, those ceremonial institutions which were of a Sabbatical nature, represented in this the leading institution of this kind, and prescribed on the very confines of bondage. These, and all the peculiarities of that Covenant, were entombed together with "the body prepared for Him." (Ps. xl. 6—8; Heb. x. 5; Rom. vii. 4; N. B. xiv. 9.) And when He rose, He left them in their sepulchre, as a shroud which had served its purpose, like all the ceremonial shadows and adapted institutions of Moses.

Now there is a sense in which it is our duty, as Christians, to "keep this feast," and its Sabbaths, of which the Gentile Apostle asserts generally, "the body

is of Christ;" or, whence his exhortation to do this? Its Mosaic appointments were indicative of *mourning*, as well as of *rejoicing*. The destruction merited, but averted by the sprinkled blood of the typical Lamb; the "bitter herbs" with which it was eaten, emblematical of bondage; the solemn silence, darkness, and retirement in which it began, and which were to be maintained, emblematical of sorrow for sin—and this under the penalty of death to every one who should presume to "move out of his place!" It was, however, a *feast* to the Jew, in the substantial truth involved in the type, as it is to the believer. Deliverance was at hand! The enlightened Jew, by faith *passing over* the mysterious emblems of this ordinance, looked to the deliverance actual and typified; and in this great feast, commemorative and predictive of salvation, *rejoiced* in the significant institution, and in hope of the rest, to which it was an immediate and leading precursor. Whilst the disciples were *mourning* over Him "who bore our sins in His own body on the tree," and led by the providence of God through the vista of ages, the Law, the Covenant, and its Sign, were laid, by a marvellous concurrence, in one common and peaceful grave, their work being accomplished; the followers of Jesus were unconsciously *passing over* these "rudiments of the world," although, perhaps, the body of disciples "rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment." The march of the Church, like that of Israel out of Egypt, from the finished bondage of the law was begun. (Luke xxiii. 56.) Luke's declaration relates not to the Apostles, however, but to the *women*, evidently engaged in sorrowful preparation of the spices for embalming the body of Jesus, which had a better preservative in the

will of the Father. The note of triumph was preparing in the resurrection of the Son of God, and in His presentation of Himself to the Church, as "the first-fruits of them that slept."

To this, then, we now devote our attention, as a prominent feature in the Passover feast of Moses.

The *presentation of first-fruits* of the first or barley harvest, was on the morrow after the first holy convocation day of the feast, or the *second day* of the feast of unleavened bread.

On this day our Lord rose from the dead, and on this day He first presented Himself to His assembled disciples. The Head and the Church held their first meeting under the new and permanent dispensation. (Mark xvi. 10, 14; Luke xxii. 12; xxiv. 33; John xx. 19.) In the concurrence of the day of first-fruits with our Lord's resurrection, it is not the *mere fact* that is intended, any more than it was the bare fact of presentation of the first-fruits in the Mosaic ordinance; but something present and future, beyond it, and involved in this fact as well; for it is not reasonable to suppose that this bore a relation to the Church throughout its duration under the Mosaic form of institution, and relation to the Gospel Church in this solitary transaction alone on the first day; and especially when the very phrase, "first-fruits" is applied to "the people of God," and their continual presentation of them spiritually to God is prescribed in the very epistle where we find the change of the day of rest, and the duty of "assembling together," asserted. Whatever might be the motive of the *disciples* for meeting in a body at this time, the fact of Christ's appearance, and sanction of it, are not to be denied. The Sabbath, and Convocation day preceding, had been *passed over* by

them unobserved. For even when Mary, to whom He first appeared, hastened to announce His resurrection to the disciples, she found them mourning and weeping. (Mark xvi. 10.) The day had ceased to be to them "a delight." The growing rumour of His resurrection ; recollection that He predicted this event, imperfectly understood indeed (Luke xxiv. 21) ; His appearance, especially to Peter who had denied him, as well as to others of the body, might partially account for this *first* convention of the disciples on this day. But when we consider, above all, the over-ruling providence of God, bringing into one common grave with Jesus two leading ordinances of the law feast, *both of which were Sabbaths* of this institution, and were then in a course of observance by the Jews ; and the use made by Jesus of this presentation day of the law, in His character as "the first-fruits from the dead," (1 Cor. xv. ; Luke xxiv. 33 ; Eph. ii. 1—7,) with "the first-fruits" of the Church "unto God." we cannot but be impressed by the unquestionable significance of this meeting. Besides, there is an undeniable fulfilment of *three* out of the *five* prominent points of this Mosaic festival ; two concurring on that first day, which has been sanctified ever since by the Gospel Church. The permanent duty of "keeping the feast," implied in the exhortation of St. Paul, cannot be denied. As what was *prefigured* was also *prescribed*, I see no rational conclusion but that this is the Gospel day of holy rest, embodying all the Sabbatical principles and duties of the law in Gospel freedom. (Luke xxiv.) And how striking is His address at this first appearance to the body during the narration of the disciples who had just returned from Emmaus, (Luke xxiv. 33, 34,) "*Peace be unto you.*" What but peace between God and man

is fully expressive of a holy rest ? It is the very *meaning* of the Sabbath, in its temporal sanctification and eternal design, "*Peace be unto you !*" He claimed His title as "the Prince of Peace." (Isa. lvii. 19.) He now exercised the prerogative asserted seven centuries before by the Prophet, "I create peace, saith the Lord." Thus did He vindicate His right as "Lord of the Sabbath day."

He had said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." (John v. 17). And now, having "finished the work which the Father had given Him to do," He proclaims an accomplishment of that which angels had announced at His birth ; and says in effect, "My Father resteth hitherto, and I rest." And let my people rest. For the rest of the Son of God is, indeed, peace to the weary ; a holy rest with Him ; a holy peace in Him !

Thomas, it appears, was absent from this meeting of the Apostles, and of many, perhaps, of "the hundred and twenty" who were faithful to their professions of attachment to Jesus. (Mark xvi. 10 ; Luke xxii. 18 ; Acts i. 2, 3, 4, 6, 12—15.)

It may be observed, that Mark and Luke, when speaking of the body of Apostles convened on the day of resurrection, call them "the eleven," when but ten, according to John, were there. The text in Mark, (xvi. 14), describes the body as *sitting at meat*, whilst the margin renders it simply, "sat together ;" and which is evidently correct, as Jesus asked them, "Have ye here any meat?" (Luke xxiv. 41, 42.) Scott suggests that Thomas had apostatized. His language implies both that he had witnessed the closing scene on Calvary, and maintained most resolute unbelief of

His resurrection. (Mark xvi. 14 ; Luke xxiv. 33 ; John xx. 24 ; Burnside, p. 167.)

Everything that passed at this assembly of the Church was in harmony with an introduction of the new Sabbath. In the address of Jesus the necessity of a "fulfilment of all things which were written in the *law of Moses*, and in the *Prophets*, and in the *Psalms*, concerning Him," was enforced. (Luke xxiv. 44.) Power was communicated to them, "to understand the Scriptures ;" and more particularly those parts which indicated the *necessity of His death, and resurrection on the third day*, giving point to the Passover type in the transaction then occurring ! As many things not written were done by Jesus, so many things not written were said. (John xxi. 30, 31.) His mission of the Apostles was renewed, and extended to "all nations." (John xx. 19—24.) A measure of the Holy Ghost was imparted through the significant act of breathing upon them by the Son of God. The efficacy of this gift and instruction was instantly manifested on the day of His ascension, in the address of Peter to the Church, and the election of a successor to Judas by the whole body. (Acts i.) The commission was given to preach "repentance, and remission of sins, beginning at Jerusalem." The extraordinary power of imparting to penitent believers the peace which they had received themselves was conferred. Communications were made of "things pertaining to the kingdom of God." (Acts i. 3.) And the promise of the Holy Spirit made before His crucifixion was renewed. And, thus prepared, the *second* meeting stands, so far as the Apostles were concerned, on widely different grounds from the *first*.

It took place on the day after the *second Holy Convocation day*. Again there was a concurrence with this of the Jews' ordinary sabbath ; and which would, as before, constitute it "a high day."

Now, this *second Convocation day* of the feast was appointed by Moses to be on the eighth day from the sacrifice of the Passover Lamb, or on the seventh day of the feast of unleavened bread. And this *second* meeting of Jesus and His Church on the first day of the week, was on the eighth day from the time when the act of death, so to speak, of "the Lamb of God," ceased in His resurrection from the dead. Again, He and His Church passed over the Sabbath, law, and covenant of Moses, *buried* as typically in the Red Sea of old. Again, it is emphatically said, "*After eight days again*, His disciples were within, and Thomas with them." (John xx. 26. See Greek Test.) "Jesus cometh, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, "Peace be unto you." *

There is a peculiar emphasis in the mention of the days of these meetings in the Gospel narrative of the accurate John, whose record both of *the first* and *second* is very peculiar. (xx. 19.) "*Then, the same day at evening, being the first day of the week,*" &c. Of the *second* he says, "*after eight days again*, His disciples

* The "Modern Sabbath Examined" says, "After eight days, refers more naturally to the day after than to the following Sunday," i.e., to *the Monday*. This is impossible. The expression "after days" refers, palpably, to the 19th verse. This conjecture connects a *ninth* day with the period; for Monday would be the *ninth*: whereas, the *eighth* must limit the period named, and *stand together* with the other days comprised within it, according to the invariable usage of the preposition $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$.

were within." (xx. 26.) That this was on the *eightth day* admits not of any reasonable doubt. A similar phrase was clearly understood in the same way by the disciples ; "after three days," *i.e.*, on the *third day*. (Matt. xxvii. 63 ; Luke xxiv. 21.) There is a palpable reference in this expression "*again*," to the *first* meeting which was on the *first day*. It is an expression too singular and remarkable to be devoid of meaning. Nor is it to be forgotten that the whole mass of scriptural evidence was present to "the mind," by which these accounts were recorded. So "the house of the Lord was sanctified in eight days." (2 Chron. xxix. 17.) The sanctified day was thus fairly launched into the dispensation of the Gospel, and the typical grave of the Red Sea passed over. It will be asked why the Mosaic *presentation* day should synchronize with our *first day*, and neither the *first* nor *second* days of holy convocation. This is the most wonderful verification of the Providence. The one was *not* a Sabbath ; and the day of the Mosaic ordinance fell on the first day. But two things were to be secured as to these holy convocation days : first, their sabbatical *abolition*, which would have been doubtful in any observance under the Gospel ; second, their *transference* in body to the Gospel. This could only be secured in their transition by the Church, and which wonderfully occurred twice over.* It is a

* If the Passover Lamb were killed between three and six o'clock on Thursday evening, esteemed as the fourteenth day, and as entering at that time, then, how marvellous is the correspondence ! The first Holy Convocation day was on the third day from the death of the lamb ; and the second Holy Convocation day on the eighth. So our first Gospel Holy Convocation day was correspondently on the third day from the death of

misreading to ascribe this *assembly* to the “fear of the Jews;” for this meeting would have offered the very opportunity desired by their enemies, to exterminate the whole body at one blow. It is evident that they went into and out of Jerusalem in open day, whatever *secret* apprehension might be felt. The “fear of the Jews” led to the “*shutting of the doors*,” not to the *meeting*; and to this *cause* the verse ascribes the *act*. (John xx. 19.)

The convention of the whole body in the heart of the metropolis would have been *unnatural* under their apprehensions of peril; as it is both natural to expect that every precaution would be taken by them against a surprise; and that some very powerful *motive* must have led to this assembly, notwithstanding their secret alarm. One of the motives to make their common abode in this upper room is stated immediately after His *ascension*,—“These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication.” (Acts i. 14.) But, from the command of Jesus that they should *tarry* in Jerusalem, it is not impossible but that they might have contemplated a *departure* from the city. This command indicated the still perturbed state of their minds.

It is a gratuitous assumption, surely, to ascribe this second meeting to our Lord's condescension to the unbelief of Thomas alone. The same *proofs* were presented to the whole body at the *first* meeting. Nor can the disciples be supposed to have assembled only with that view, unless they had known positively that Jesus would appear there; and then a significant direction must have been given to this effect. (Acts ii.) But

Jesus; and our second on the eighth day from the cessation of the act of death.

we *do* find them assembled a *third* time within the fifty days, and on the *first day* of the week, by *common consent*; nor does it appear on the record that Jesus met them personally on this day of the week, excepting in the two instances named.* For, though it be said, "He was seen of them forty days," (i. 3,) yet it is not to be necessarily inferred that this occurred every day; or, we should hardly have had such a careful enumeration by St. Paul and others, of the various occasions on which this did take place. (Matt. xxvii. 16—20; Mark xiv. 14. N.B. "to the eleven;" therefore, at the second meeting on the first day. Luke xxiv. 13, 50—53; 1 Cor. xv; Acts i. 4—12; John xx. 24, 26—28; xxi. 1—5.) To the apostle Paul himself. (Acts xxii; 1 Cor. xv.) If "the feasts of new moons" prefigured the great festival of the Gospel Church on an instant change of state from the Mosaic form by the resurrection, then it is observable that the Jews, to preclude mistake, often observed *two days* at that feast. Certainly the silver trumpet sounded at the resurrection, when the church emerged from beneath its earthly shadow, and shone forth "fair as the moon."

Besides, Jesus applied these meetings, as we have seen, to most important and significant public uses. And even our Lord's address to Thomas looked evidently beyond him; "because thou hast seen, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and have believed." (John xx. 25—30.)

Thomas came there in unbelief. His language implies a previous conversation with some of those to

* We know that His appearance to them at the sea of Tiberias was only the third within about the first *ten* days of the forty. (John xxi. 14.)

whom Jesus had appeared at the first meeting ; “except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails,” &c., as the others had already done. Burnside *assumes* from this plainly-implicated communication between Thomas and some of the body, that there had been a *third meeting* within the period intervening between the two on the first day. (p. 169.) There is not any scriptural ground for this assumption.* Nay, John’s record of His presence at the second meeting on the first day implicates, in its very phraseology, rather the reverse. (xx. 26.) But, were it a fact that this intermediate meeting occurred, Jesus did not appear ; which would confer a marked distinction on the other two on the first day. *Their* representations had brought him there. But why on this rather than on any other day of the week ? Was it that the meeting on this day formed part of those things spoken to them by Jesus “pertaining to the kingdom of God ?” Certainly, it was not an occurrence of chance ; nor one devoid of an object and important meaning on the part of *Jesus*. And, indeed, the same must be said as to the ten apostles ; for an earnest of the Spirit had been communicated ; much oral and scriptural instruction imparted, in which the *death* and *resurrection* of Christ were prominent topics, as well as the *necessary* fulfilment of Scriptures relating to these things. In each of these leading branches, as enumerated by Jesus, we have seen proofs of a predicted, prefigured, or prescribed day of holy rest under the Gospel. Why not, then, because of a previously *understood* observance of *the day* of the Gospel rest ? It is, certainly, scriptural to look for the fulfilment of leading Mosaic institutions

* See the note page 255.

in corresponding Gospel facts. And here we have two occurring in the precise order of these ordinances of the great Passover feast ; and with the presentation of the first-fruits of the second harvest, as will be seen ; and this on the first day, the Pentecostal feast-day, substantiating, on the corresponding days, the shadows of this most significant Mosaic institution. It is very certain that Jesus foresaw what would be the practical inference deduced by His Church from these facts, and that He would never have left it in capital error in such an important matter.

That these *prefigured* facts, then, were virtually *prescriptive* of a sabbatical duty to the Gospel Church ; and that *conviction* of the apostles including Thomas and the first believers of the fact of Christ's resurrection, were *collateral* points alone, appears both rational and plain. The *lessons*, evidently, are emphatic and permanent. In *the first* of these meetings we have the *presentation* of Him who is the real "first-fruits of them that slept," and on the very day. In *the other*, there is *a leading instance* to show the necessity and practical blessedness of this holy "assembling" of the Church before God, through its Head to plead and present, on the same memorable day, the festive offerings of "the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth," now assured of their acceptance by the accepted sacrifice of the true Paschal Lamb ; and "as a kind of first-fruits of his creatures," to confess Him as "their Lord, and their God," the Creator of the spiritual seed, the Sovereign of "the world to come," the Lord of the Gospel rest. And, in addition to this, there is a *second* testimony to the transference of the Sabbath, and of all sabbatical duties, to the Gospel and its rest. There is, also, the Gentile

apostle's exhortation to commemorate, under the Gospel, these prefigured emblems of the law. (1 Cor. v. 6, 7.) "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast," &c.

As the commemorative shadow of Israel's deliverance out of the bondage of Egypt was maintained through a sabbatical ordinance during the dispensation of Moses, so has the memorial of the rescue of God's spiritual Israel from the captivity of sin been preserved by the Gospel Church, in the holy rest of "the Lord's day."

In the fact, as I believe, that Jesus met the Church in person only twice on this day, and on the third assembly *recorded* sent down the Holy Ghost—not necessarily excluding holy meetings by the body of the Church in the period intervening before Pentecost—a peculiar and prescriptive lesson appears to be implied. (John xxi. 14.) Ascription of these things to an emphatic sanction of the *first day* as a perpetual and holy rest, assigns an object worthy the occasion, all its attendant and succeeding wonders, and maintains a consistency of object in these meetings. But the opposing explanations are of a fugitive and temporary character as to the first meeting; relate to an individual alone in the second; do not touch the third at all; and leave the Church as a body, wholly out of view. Thus, as the Church had celebrated the Passover twice under the conduct of Moses in the wilderness, and then constantly on an entrance into the promised land, so was the rest of the Son of man observed in the convention of the Church twice under the personal presence of its Great Prophet and Head, and then on each recurring first day, to the present hour. I mention this only to show how every feature of the Passover feast has its correspondence in connection with this Gospel rest.

The appearance to seven of His disciples at the sea of Tiberias was not either on the seventh or first day of the week, nor connected with any Mosaic ordinances, or the worship of the Church; and it contrasts strikingly with the definite, more solemn, and public occasions to which I have already referred. It appears to have related chiefly to the *establishment* of Peter, whose sorrow was not a mere transient ebullition of grief, as the early message and appearance of our Lord to him; and this additional assurance of His pardon and favour at the sea of Tiberias, prove: and this was so far *personal* to this apostle. But the practical lessons deducible from this interview, as to the Church and individual ministers, are of very high importance indeed. And who knows how many misgivings might have still oppressed this penitent apostle's mind; especially as no personal assurance, like that to Thomas, had been vouchsafed at either of the two meetings of the body by our Lord. The first exhibition of His recent wounds was made to them as a body. (Luke xxiv. 38—40.) For, even this purposed *omission* of His fallen and sorrowing apostle had its meaning; nor is conscience slow to apprehend, nor to doubt, under the peculiar circumstances of Peter. And after his assurance at the sea of Tiberias, Peter's confidence revived, as proved by his question relative to John; "Lord, what shall this man do?" (John xxi. 21.)

The last point to be noticed in the Passover feast is the presentation of the first-fruits of the *second* or wheat harvest, on the fiftieth day.

"The count" of the fifty days was to begin on the morrow after the first day of the feast of unleavened bread; the presentation day of the barley harvest. From this day seven sabbaths were to be counted; the Pente-

costal feast following on the day after the *last* of these *seven* Sabbaths. The wave sheaf of the wheat harvest was then presented ; and "the he-lamb without blemish, of the first year, for a burnt-offering to the Lord," sacrificed. (Lev. xxiii. 11, 12, 15, 16.)

Should it be said that the counting of these seven Sabbaths excludes the first after the resurrection, then this must either constitute the presentation day one of the seven, which is unjustifiable by the Mosaic directions, or we must pass over the first Sabbath after the resurrection, because of the interval not including seven clear days without the *first day*; and thus *more* than fifty days would be comprised in the period from the presentation to the day of Pentecost. This proves, undeniably, that these Sabbaths were to be counted so that the Sabbath next to the day of offering the wave sheaf of barley, be this when it might, was to be included in the seven.

This Pentecost *must* have been on the first day, because ordained to follow a Sabbath. By retrospective enumeration from this point, assured to us by Scripture, it will be determined infallibly that the fifty days *did* include the day of resurrection. (See Burnside, pp. 169, 170.) "Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath." What Sabbath? From the holy convocation *Sabbath* of the feast of unleavened bread, named in the 7th verse of that chapter. (Lev. xxiii. 7, 15, 16.) And the morrow after the Sabbath is evidently included ; carefully explained as meaning the presentation day of "the sheaf of the wave offering ;" and proved by the retrospective computation of days from Pentecost, to be unquestionably the day after the last Sabbath, or one of the fifty days.

The language of Moses is very precise. Had the *count* been made *from the Sabbath* merely it would have been ambiguous, whether or not it were to be from the beginning or termination of this convocation day. But "from the morrow after the Sabbath," &c., both excludes this Sabbath, and includes the morrow, so as to make the fifty days both begin with a termination of the Sabbath, and an entrance of the day of presentation, which was the morrow after the Sabbath, or the fifteenth day. And John, I do not doubt in the least, means "after eight days" of the fifty days which had set in on the day of resurrection, and a precise computation of which Moses had so carefully secured. This substantiates what was said of the act of death.

TABLE.

Thursday Evening to Friday Evening, or 6th Day.	{ The Passover Feast. "Preparation of the Passover:" "The day of Unleavened Bread," in popular phraseology. Sacrifice of the Lamb.
Friday Evening to Saturday Evening, or 7th Day.	{ Exod. xii.; Lev. xxiii.; Luke xx. 14—16. First day of the feast of Unleavened Bread. "First Holy Convocation Day," "a high day." (John xix. 31.) THE CRUCIFIXION.
Saturday Evening to Sunday Evening, 1st Day of the Week.	{ The wave sheaf of Barley offered. (Lev. xxiii. 10, 11.) The first day of the Week. (John xx. 1.) THE RESURRECTION.
Monday to Saturday, 2nd to 7th Day.	{ The day from which the <i>count</i> of seven Sabbaths began, ruling the Pentecostal Feast. (Lev. xxiii. 15, 16.) First Appearance of Jesus to His church, as "the first-fruits of them that slept."
	{ First of the Seven Sabbaths.

TABLE.

Sunday to Saturday, 8th to 14th Day. }	The Second Sabbath.
Sunday to Saturday, 15th to 21st Day. }	The Third Sabbath.
Sunday to Saturday, 22nd to 28th Day. }	The Fourth Sabbath.
Sunday to Saturday, 29th to 35th Day. }	The Fifth Sabbath.
Sunday to Saturday, 36th to 40th, and 42nd Day. }	ASCENSION. The Sixth Sabbath.
Sunday to Saturday, 43rd to 49th Day. }	The Seventh Sabbath.

Fiftieth Day. Pentecost. First Day of the Week. New Meat Offering. Wave Sheaf of Wheat Offering. (Lev. xxiii. 16, 20, 22, 24.)

Now, after the ascension of Jesus, and on the return of the body of disciples to the upper room, there is the narrative of an election of the successor to Judas. The account is given as if the proceeding, and the scriptural ground on which it was based, had arisen spontaneously in St. Peter's mind. But it was evidently suggested by the Holy Ghost illuminating and applying otherwise obscure predictions in the Psalms, as directive in this procedure. (Ps. lxxix. 25 ; cix.) So that it appears plain, even before the plenary inspiration of Pentecost, that their proceedings were under a direct guidance of the Spirit. It is expressly declared that Jesus, "until the day that He was taken up, had, through the Holy Ghost, given commandments unto the apostles whom He had chosen." (Acts i. 3.) And even were their first meeting on the first day excluded because previous

to the gift of this directive power, yet this cannot be so with the second. And this would confer a reflective sanction upon the first. Much less can the meeting on the day of Pentecost be excepted, as undeniably within that declaration; and held, it is expressly declared, by common consent of the body subsequent to these "commands by the Holy Ghost." The promise of the Spirit was in general terms; "not many days hence." Here, then, are two facts attesting the meeting of the church; and, undeniably, occurring under divine direction on the day in dispute; and no good reason offered for denuding the other, which took place first and on the same day of the week, of all importance; sanctioned, blessed, and enforced, as both the first and second meetings were, by the presence and teaching of the Great Head of the church Himself; and the third crowned by the descent of the Holy Ghost. (Acts i. 13, 15.) The apostles, it appears, "abode together;" and yet it is observably said "they were *all*," not apostles alone, but the whole "hundred and twenty," not because of this common abidance, but evidently for some other reason, "they were *all, with one accord*, in one place." Nor was it to keep the Passover feast of the fiftieth day; for this could only be done in the temple, and as Moses had prescribed. (Lev. xxiii. 16—21.) The Lord's Supper had been instituted. The command of Jesus had been issued under circumstances never to be forgotten: "This do in remembrance of Me." They had witnessed the presence of Jesus, received the instruction and blessing of the Spirit, on the same day. They had received "commands by the Holy Ghost;" and had seen every previous ceremonial appointment of the Passover feast fulfilled under their Master's presence and dispensation. And it

is only rational to conclude, whatever hope might be entertained of realizing now the fulfilment of the *last*, yet, that their primary object was to keep holy the *rest day* of the Son of man, and to show forth His death, and resurrection, too, in partaking on this day, when their Lord had broken the fetters of "the king of terrors," of the sacred emblems of His body broken and His blood shed for sinners.

Our Lord's mention, or prediction, of an existing Sabbath at the approaching destruction of Jerusalem, is quite consistent both with His previous directions, that His followers should not prematurely separate from those who "sat in Moses' seat," with their sanctification of the first day's holy rest after His resurrection ; with His contemporaneous cautions against compliance with any of the corruptions of the law ; and with the limit assigned, in that very context, to this forbearance ; when, having "filled up the measure of their fathers," their house, or church, should be left in desolation. (Matt. xxiii.)

Surely, the sabbatarian alone can make any plausible use of this casual mention of the Sabbath connectedly with the desolation of the city, temple, and institutions of the Jews ! For the arguments of opponents to the day of holy rest, on moral and divine grounds, are based on a total abrogation of the law and Sinaitic prescription. But to what *fact* and *time* will they assign this abolition ? It cannot be severed from the work of Jesus Christ, which fulfils, and so removes, the whole law of Moses ; and which both Jesus and the Gentile apostle, as already observed, ascribe to His death. (Matt. xxiv. 20 ; xxiii. 1 ; Rom. vii. 4.)

Should this be denied, and an abolition of the Mosaic institutions be restricted to their cessation *de facto*, and not *de veritate*, (from fact, and not from truth,) then, were this even admitted, an existence of the seventh-day observance—of circumcision—of “days, and months, and years,” &c.,—and the ceremonial worship connected,—present an insurmountable difficulty, since there was not this *de facto* cessation. Did this mention of a Sabbath prove anything, it would be the sabbatarian position.

The law ceased, in truth, when Christ “blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross.” (Col. ii. 14.)

This casual mention of the Sabbath, under the facts and circumstances named, would not prove an obligation on Christians to sanctify a day of rest; nor does it interfere with, or affect, the co-existent observance of the first day, favoured as this is by the late assembly on the first day; like men who could not devote two successive days wholly to religious duties, were obliged to act with secrecy and caution; and who had been, perhaps, occupied by temporal pursuits in the earlier part of the day. The very fact of flight on this day being an aggravation of the calamity, places the Saviour’s meaning beyond contradiction; the Sabbath day’s journey falling short, possibly, of any refuge, and the day being an occasion of peril from those “zealous of the law;” and its extension exposing the Christian to the penalties of the law, and to the pain of religious scruples, perhaps, as well. The other part of the merciful direction of Jesus has been wholly disregarded;

"Pray ye that *your flight be not in the winter*, neither on the Sabbath day." And St. Mark does not even name the Sabbath at all in the direction ! (xiii. 18.)

The remarkable phrase of the Apocalypse is now to be examined, viz., "*The Lord's Day.*" Does this, then, literally mean *a day* designated and familiarly known, as this incidental mention of it would imply, as "*the Lord's day ?*" And to *what* day, if the phrase be used of a literal day, is it to be applied ?

Burnside will not admit any application of the phrase to Jesus Christ because the word is the same as that which is applied by St. Paul to "the Lord's Supper." (Pp. 192, 193 ; 1 Cor. xi. 20, Gr. Test.) However, he is not unwilling to allow its propriety as applied to the rest of the Father. His reason is thus stated, "We have an undeniable appointment of this *ordinance* by Jesus Christ, justifying the application."

But this assumes that there has not been any prescription, implied or direct, of a holy rest under the Gospel. We have this undeniable *fact* that the word is used to *qualify*, and so to indicate, one leading ordinance of the Lord ; and, therefore, it *may* be applied in the same way to another, or to "the Lord's day" of holy rest. I do not desire to enlist the phrase in Corinthians to support my argument beyond this at the present. It is not a question, whatever its difficulties, that lies so remote from proof as to require any *little* arguments.

It is conjectured, by the author of "The Modern Sabbath Examined," that the passage may be paraphrased in this way, "I was in spirit, and received a revelation relating to the day of the Lord." As this is not the *natural* interpretation of the expressions, it rested with

him to present proof. Instead of this, *conjecture* is offered ! Here it might be fairly left without additional notice.

This conjecture is encompassed by insuperable difficulties. I must say, after all the hard words used by him towards opponents on this question, that there is not one argument in support of our obligation to sanctify a day of holy rest, which does not exceed this in strength ; for it removes the *qualification* by the adjective from *the day*, to the *subject* of the revelation ; and it involves an erroneous statement of this subject. It is further open to this objection, that whilst every *revelation* of the Lord possesses an inherent importance, which renders such an arrangement of language, generally speaking, unnecessary to impart prominence, yet the same cannot be said of every *day* on which a supernatural communication may be made. All days are the Lord's, but "the day of the Lord," as referrible to the whole Gospel era, may be a widely different thing from *one day* eminent above all others ; called "the Lord's," in some peculiar sense ; and, because of this peculiarity, made prominent by such a qualification in the language.

The passage is a remarkable one. The adjective, contrary to ordinary arrangement, is prefixed to the noun which it qualifies, and with the article ; but it is both in the gender of the qualified noun, and not in the neuter, as an abstract noun, omitting the substantive altogether.

It seems plainly intended by this to make prominent the quality of *the day*, in comparison with other days ; as that day which specially pertains to "the Lord." And thus God denominates the Sabbath, "My holy day." (Is. lviii. 13.)

The preposition, too, confines us to a restricted meaning, and one which accords strictly to this view. As *εν* signifies "habitation," so does it invariably imply that what *precedes* it is contained in what *follows*. The sense, therefore, appears to be this : that St. John was wholly absorbed in spirit, and that this state of inspiration continued in the entire Lord's day.

This preposition is never used, I believe, in a sense that would justify his conjecture that the phrase, *εν τη κυριακῃ ημερᾷ*, signifies, "*relating to the day of the Lord.*" So far would this be from agreement with usage that, whilst any measure of relation would satisfy the conjecture, nothing short of a complete absorption of the day would answer its invariable application and radical sense.

The right idiomatic translation, I feel assured, can only be this : "I was *in* spirit, *in* the Lord's day," *i.e.*, "wholly wrapt *in* a state of inspiration, and *in* the entire Lord's day." The phrase, as expressive of the *concrete* quality of the noun, agrees with this. It is hard, indeed, to see how the same precise meaning can be assigned to the two phrases, *viz.*, *εν τη κυριακῃ ημερᾷ*, "in the Lord's day," and *εν τη ημερᾷ του κυριου*, "in the day of the Lord !" In the *first* there is a peculiar propriety, as the day spoken of is not only *the Lord's*, in contradistinction to every other, but it is a day continually recurring in its devotion to His worship ; whereas, the *second* might be, perhaps, an era inclusive of many days ; or, as occurs in this very book, in some of St. Paul's epistles, and in our Lord's predictions, one day alone occurring once, and no more. (Matt. xxiv. 36.)

The manner of speaking is precisely that of a person who had been absorbed by an important vision in the

whole of that holy day, and who had sat down, subsequently, to follow out the direction *as to the whole of its subject*, viz., "What thou seest write in a book" (Rev. i. 11): 1. "*Write the things which thou hast seen*;" 2. "*and the things which are*;" 3. "*and the things which shall be hereafter*." (Ver. 19.)

"And after these things I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth," &c. (Rev. vii. 1.) I cannot agree with Dr. Vale, because this portion of the vision followed the previous portions in the first six chapters of the book, that it can be concluded, therefore, to have been on *another day* than that in which the whole subject was stated to have been revealed. The succession is in the *place* of each portion relatively to the whole, and not in the *day* of its revelation. The preposition, *μετα*, signifies *connection, concomitance*, and means *with*; whereas, a communication on another day would not be *with* that which was on "the Lord's day." (See "Paralipomena," by Dr. Vale, Art. 826, 827. Jones gives an illustrative quotation, expressive of its signification, viz., "to fight *with* the Trojans," i.e., not in behalf of them as allies, but *in the midst* of them as foes, in *close* engagement.)

This is the subject. It would appear that the Apocalypse was presented to the Apostle in vision, and as a whole; and pursued by him as one recording a communication, *currente calamo*. (See Griesbach, Note p., *Æthiopic Version*, "*in die ferie prime*," i.e., Sunday.)

This restriction of the sense to *one day* is in exact harmony with the context, throughout which the same minute detail is maintained,—a feature which is in very contrast to this conjecture. (Rev. i. 9.) The Apostle

records *the place* where the vision was presented ; *the occasion* of his residence there ; his *personal condition* at the time ; his *relation* to the Church, in its present condition and future glory ; and his *past services*, and *testimony* to his Master. These are all carefully detailed. *The time* when he was favoured with this vision, and *the period* in which this state of inspiration endured, are here instantly subjoined, completing and harmonizing the whole account. (Ver. 10.)

It is, besides, very doubtful to me if this wide and indeterminate sense be *ever* assigned to "the day of the Lord" in any one of the twenty-five instances where it is found in the Scriptures. The quotation from the Thessalonians has not, certainly, any such meaning. (1 Thess. v. 2.) This is evident from the context *immediately* preceding in the fourth chapter. (iv. 13—18 ; 2 Pet. iii. 10. See Is. ii. 12 ; xiii. 6 ; Mal. iv. 1.)

Everything appears to restrict the meaning to this *one day*. In like manner St. John speaks in this book of an eminent and solemn day of righteous retribution on the enemies and oppressors of the Church. (Rev. vi. 17 ; Matt. xxiv. 36.)

It is not a natural interpretation of our Lord's assertion as to Abraham, "He rejoiced to see my day," &c., to apply this to the whole Gospel era, when the plain sense, stated before, is both more rational, and consistent with the transactions to which it relates? Is it not a groundless conjecture, indeed, that "the day of the Lord," or the whole Gospel era, as contended for here, was ever seen by that patriarch, as it was, unquestionably, by St. John, although the expressions under our consideration have yet nothing to do with this fact ?

It was the conquest over death in the day, or fact of Christ's death and resurrection, indicated in the very place laid as the scene—"the land of Moreh," in which "the mount of the Lord" was situated, where the real temple was "built up again in three days." (Gen. xxii. 2, N.B. 4, "on the third day," 14.)

When indefinite time is intended we do not find any such expressions. "In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in the day of salvation have I helped thee." But even here a restricted interpretation might be reasonably entertained. (Is. xlix. 8 ; Luke xix. 42.)

In opening the third division of his subject, *i.e.*, the *future history of the Church*, at the fourth chapter, the Apostle repeats, in the identical expressions of the first chapter, the *inspiration* of what he was about to record. But it is observable that the time, and other circumstances attendant on the vision as already detailed, are not noticed again ; which confirms the preceding view of it as comprised within "the Lord's day." And thus, as the Bible begins with the Creation, so does it terminate in the consummation, restoration, and eternal establishment of all things.

If the Apocalypse, precious as it must ever be to those who love the Church "in the truth," and are properly jealous of the honour of its glorious Head, or who regard the blessing promised to its careful, conscientious study, and the denunciations against any addition to, or any mutilation of, its contents,—if this book were *all but unknown for so long a time*, then Burnside's conjecture, that this disputed phrase is an *interpolation*, is untenable. Obscurity would render such a design difficult for want of ready access, and obviate the motive to

such daring and impious dishonesty, promoted, if at all, by notoriety of the book. Besides, the *conjecture* presupposes entertainment of the claims and obligation of *the day*, to whatever extent. Certainly, were an interpolation made, this supposed obscurity might diminish the chances of detection.

However, if the book were so little known; and if controversy about a holy observance of the first day did not, as he says, exist; and much more, were there prevailing belief in a prescribed change from the seventh to the first day of worship, so strongly attested by the undeniable practice of the Church;—then some *motive* must be assigned to an act which could only be that of an advocate of “the Lord’s day.” For, in the first case of universal admission of obligation to sanctify *the seventh day*, there would not be any opponent, nor any strong motive, to commit such a fraud. And, in the second, the only persons likely to do it could not have had any inducement to do it, in proof of a duty which was admitted already. Besides, it does not appear very likely that a person who would commit such an unprincipled act, would entertain the regard implied for the sanctification of any day to the Lord. Were this, indeed, an *interpolation*, no artist ever before inserted “a piece of new cloth” with such “fine-drawn” skill that there should not be any discernible distinction of it from the contexture of the fabric.

But upon *what* could this phrase have been *grounded*, if there were not any first day’s holy observance at the time of this imaginary interpolation? What hope could any rational being entertain that it would be attached—founded as it must be in a nonentity—to one special day out of seven? Nay, who can even conjecture with what

design it was interpolated, without an admission of what, according to this author, had not any existence? *Admit* a holy observance of the first day ; dispute as to an *addition* of the *seventh day*, or a *substitution* of the *first day* for the *seventh*;—and *then* there is something upon which this might rest, but which, after all, cannot be reasonably explained, as it has been seen. The question raised so early about Easter, involves an admission of “the Lord’s day” claims to a certain extent. This controversy between the Greek and Romish Churches began near the end of the second century.*

Scott, indeed, and Horne, in contradiction to the opinion both of Burnside and “The Modern Sabbath Examined,” say that the Apocalypse was “very generally, if not universally, acknowledged in the first two centuries, and yet in the third century it began to be questioned.” (Intro. to Rev.) Horne dates John’s exile to Patmos, on the ground of general belief, A. D. 95.

If John used the phrase as ordinarily understood, which I cannot doubt, it implies that the day was then as well known and devoted to the Lord. And it is a confirmatory fact that Ignatius applied the phrase to Sunday, A. D. 101. He denominates it “the queen of days.”

If *St. John’s Gospel* WERE written subsequently to the *Revelation*, it does not follow that he would there call the first day “the Lord’s day;” for he was narrating facts as actually existent at the period to which his narrative relates, when the Jewish Sabbath was observed, and when Christians, undeniably, participated in its

* Dr. Vale says, “When we consider the circumstances of Palm Sunday, Easter Sunday, and Whit Sunday, what day was so likely to be called the Lord’s day as Sunday?”—PARALIPOMENA, Art. §26.

celebration ; and his Gospel appears to be written with a peculiar literal accuracy of detail. As he *might* have thus denominated it had he spoken of the first day,—that he does not do so is rather an implied proof, if anything, that his Gospel was written prior to the Revelation. His Gospel extends but to a few days beyond the resurrection ; terminates, therefore, before the day of Pentecost ; could not, with any propriety, admit a term of posterior origin to the events narrated ; and when the establishment of a new day of worship was in actual progress ; or rather, when “the Lord’s day” had been just introduced, and when this phrase was not attached to the day.

It appears certain to me that John’s *Gospel* was *first* written. His own words, in the introduction to the book of Revelation, are surely conclusive testimony to this fact :—“Who bare record of the word of God ; and of *testimony of Jesus Christ* ; and of all things which he saw.” (Rev. i. 2.) Can any man reasonably apply this to his Epistles ? To the Revelation ? Or, much more, to those alone, as it must be done if the Gospel were written after the Apocalypse ? Scott applies this, most strangely, to the Revelation itself ; whereas, the subject of the Apocalypse is plainly laid down in the 19th verse. Were his Gospel written after Revelation and his Epistles, this reference to *past* written testimonies could only be to what is not extant. The first Epistle opens with a manifest reference to the striking introduction of his Gospel ; to his record of the first appearance of Jesus to the Church after His resurrection ; and to the ocular demonstration of that fact, narrated by him and by St. Luke. (Luke xxiv. 29 ; John xx. 20 ; 1 John i. 1—4.) Nay, even in that Epistle, there may be a reference to his previous written communications to the Church. (ii. 14.)

For the record alluded to in the first verse of the first chapter, most probably, the Apostle was banished to Patmos. (Rev. i. 9.) I see that Guyse considers the passage referred to demonstrative of the priority of the Gospel of John. Does it admit, indeed, of any reasonable doubt?

That the Revelation must have been written late in the first century, is to be inferred from inductive evidence. Scott remarks on the close of the first verse of the first chapter, "He sent and signified it by His angel unto His servant John; it is probable that he was then the only surviving Apostle." He says, in his introduction to John's Gospel, that, on leaving Judea, at the destruction of Jerusalem, "it is recorded that he then went into Asia; resided some years at Ephesus;" (where he would find the Lord's day established,) "was banished to the island of Patmos by the Emperor Domitian, but returned to Asia after the death of that emperor, and lived to be nearly one hundred years of age." The formation and establishment of the seven churches, and the rise of the evils in them which are reprov'd, must have been works of time. Ephesus was destroyed by an earthquake, A.D. 19, but it was soon rebuilt. (Brown's Dicty.) Laodicea is mentioned by St. Paul, in his Epistle to Colosse. An extensive influence must be ascribed to the Ephesian Church, from the fact that St. John's message to it is part of one of the special subjects of Revelation. It appears probable that Laodicea might have been founded by St. Paul from his long residence at Ephesus, his great conflict for them, and his address to them of a special Epistle. (Acts xix. 8—12; xx. 31; Gal. i.; Col. ii. 1.) The date assigned to his Epistle to the Colossians, as of that to Laodicea, is A.D. 64, or

A.D. 62 according to Horne, "from internal evidence." His affecting farewell to the elders of Ephesus occurred at a late period of his ministry, and shortly before his appeal and transmission to Rome.

If the expressions of Revelation, "the Lord's day," were *common* in the time of Ignatius, his use of it without reference to John's authority is natural. Had the propriety of the phrase, and the implied obligation been in much dispute, excepting by the few who, in every age, will be ready at all times to dispute what they dislike, he might, perhaps, have done this. Were we possessed of all his writings, so as to be in a position to say, positively, that he did not do this, it would be a fair presumption that the phrase, and all that is comprised in it, were so notorious as to render any reference to John's authority needless.

The expression, as occurring in the Revelation, cannot have any direct regard to a mere *custom* of the Church; for a *custom* is not a *day*; but to some *one day* denominated, on some account, "*the Lord's day*," because of some special relation to "the Lord," in contradistinction to every other day. It implies, indeed, the custom of "assembling together" on this day, to confess and worship *the Lord*; and a day had notoriously existed as "the Lord's," under the preceding dispensations. And thus "the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath day" among the Gentiles, as He was among the Jews; which fact completes the proof that "the Sabbath was made for the man."

Were it, indeed, true, which Horne does not believe, that this book, so certainly inspired, was long held in such an equivocal position, it shows how little reliance can be placed on the silence, or assertions of Church

records, so as to authenticate and justify either an observance or repudiation of this day as a day of holy rest, on the ground of church authority alone.

Horne, with Sir Isaac Newton, asserts, "there is no other book of the New Testament so strongly attested, or commented upon so early as the Apocalypse." (Intro. p. 463.)

In speaking of writers in the early days of the Gospel, such as Ignatius, Justin, Irenæus, Cyprian, &c., it appears to be forgotten sometimes how little of their works, comparatively, are extant; and that there have been forgeries, interpolations, adulterations; and that divided opinions have prevailed as to many of those which have survived the ravages of time and the virulent dishonesty of party spirit. Seven only of the many works of Justin have been universally received. As to the Epistles of the first era, bearing the names of Ignatius and Polycarp, the general conclusion of Scultetus deduced from the arguments on both sides is, "that they are *probably* their works, but interpolated, and adulterated." (See "Medulla Theologiæ Patrum," *passim*.)

There is here, then, *a day* denominated by the Holy Ghost, speaking through the survivor of the Apostles, nearly at the close of the first century, "*the Lord's day*."

We have seen the Gentile Apostle abandoning all regard to the Sabbath of the law; conducting the worship of the Church on the *first day*; asserting that there is "another day" of rest on a completion of the work of the Son; and reproving a neglect "by some," in opposition therefore, to the common practice and duty of an "assembling together" of the Church; and a most remarkable fulfilment on this day of the leading points in the great Passover feast. And we have this unde-

niable fact, that this same day has been the holy rest day of the Gospel Church from its foundation,—an almost solitary instance of universal and constant agreement in the Church.

“On the first day the world had its beginning. By the resurrection of Christ death was destroyed, and life entered into the world. On this day the Apostles received commission to preach. Christ entered in to His disciples, ‘the doors being shut.’ Therefore, ‘the Lord’s day’ is no human tradition, but a Divine institution. These works, whereby ‘the Lord’s day’ is sanctified, were the works of the Trinity, and set forth in Scripture. Therefore, ‘the Lord’s day’ is instituted of God, and grounded upon Scripture.”

Again: “We have the decrees of an ancient Council of the second Synod of Cæsarea, under Theophilus, the Bishop there: who do resolve that *the Pasch* shall be kept on ‘the Lord’s day,’ *qui tot, et talibus benedictionibus est sanctificatum*, (which hath been sanctified by so many and such blessings,) as upon that day the light was created,—the Israelites went through the Red Sea,—Christ rose again upon that day, whereof it is said, ‘this is the day the Lord hath made.’” (Ps. cxviii; Willett, Syn. Pap., p. 500.)

This Synod was, no doubt, of great authority, and approved as genuine in the day of the Reformation. (Same, p. 147.)

In the sabbatarian controversy of the third century, if the question at issue were an *addition* of the *seventh* to a holy observance of the *first day*, and not a *substitution* of one for the other, *silence* is precisely what we might expect. (Mod. Sab. Exam., pp. 138, 139.) And any state of this argument implies observance of the

first day at the time. It was certainly an *addition* of Mosaic ordinances to the system of the Gospel that St. Paul opposed ; and it would seem most natural to refer the real origin of this controversy to his day. It is plain there was dispute in his time about “ days, and about the Sabbath ” of the Jewish law. That opinions of opposing parties were acted upon ; and by one party in hostility to what the Apostle approved and inculcated as to their “ assembling themselves together.” And the circumstances attendant on his own and exclusive practice as to the day, carried out at Troas, have been seen.

Nor is it doubtful to what class “ these unruly and vain talkers ” chiefly belonged ; “ specially they of the circumcision,” is his own general description. (Titus i. 10 ; Heb. x. 24, 25.) And, finding this contradiction to his own practice reprobated in an Epistle to the *Hebrews*, whether or not written by him ; and whose objection could not be to the *seventh day*,—it is only rational to conclude that it was against the *first day*, an abrogation of the seventh day ; or against any assembly for worship whatever. In this last case, the opinion of infidels will not weigh a feather in the question. It will assuredly become those who reject the conclusion above, to show about what other-day controversies, and hostile practices could possibly prevail.

And as to the hypothesis, that the Apostle’s exhortation relates to the *custom* and not to the *day*, it must not be forgotten that, in all previous provisions for worship, the *time* has ruled the *custom*. Regularity in the *practice* has been secured through precision in the *time*. And if, even in this way, the evil nature of man have overruled the prescription of God, how must it be where the *custom* might be maintained in even any

minimum which the indisposition of the human heart to religious observances might concede. The *certain* termination of a mere custom, with any discretion of man admitted as an ingredient, must be disuse.

The *assembling together* to which the Hebrews were exhorted is expressed, Bloomfield observes, by "a word used in the writings of the early Councils, where the regulations of public worship are treated of." (Recensio. Synopt., vol. viii., p. 509.) The expression, also, "for-saking," *leaving off*, or *deserting* an established observance, is remarkable at that early period in the Church. The whole subject of this analogy between the work and rest of the Father, and those of the Son, treated of by *him* who both so decidedly abandoned the Jewish Sabbath and openly observed "another day" for worship, is not without its significance to the Church. If the Apostle foresaw the disputed obligation of the day, as he did, doubtless, "the mystery of iniquity" in the germ of Judaizm, (and the lower ground of sabbatizing has been long maintained in the Romish Church,) it will explain forcibly why an adherence to which Christians were exhorted should be "so much the more, as we see the day approaching."

Cyprian, who lived in A.D. 248, believed that circumcision on the eighth day prefigured, and therefore prescribed, the first day as a day of holy rest. Whether or not this may be legitimately inferred from a comparison of Genesis xvii. with Philippians iii. 1—3, I shall not pause to inquire. But this fact is plain, that he considered a sanctification of the first day to rest on *divine* authority. Nor can it be supposed that he was singular in this belief; nor that this was the sole ground on which its obligation was then maintained.

Where, then, is the bold allegation against it as a novelty only two hundred years old? Cyprian was a man of extensive influence, and of singular gifts. But some of the works attributed to him are confessedly spurious.

If *Ignatius* were contemporary with St. John for thirty years, from an early period after our Lord's resurrection, it appears probable that he would be dead before the Book of Revelation was written. His history is very uncertain. Both his Epistles and Polycarp's, are adulterated and interpolated. So that an argument on such a grave question cannot be safely reposed either on their contents or omissions. It is thought that he was Bishop of Antioch ; and died at Rome, in the reign of Trajan ; which Emperor died A.D. 117. If St. John, then, wrote the Revelation about A.D. 95, it is quite possible that Ignatius, if he were living indeed, might be in prison at the time, and never have even seen the book. Horne dates the Apocalypse at the end of Domitian's reign, about A.D. 96 or 97. (Compend. Introd., page 463.) See also "Medulla Theologiæ Patrum;" "Fleming's Rise and Fall of Popery." (P. 137.) The silence of other writers, noticed by Burnside, might be perhaps accounted for much in the same way. And it is not at all surprising if its authenticity were disputed, or the book all but unknown, as he says ; which I totally disbelieve. It cannot but be supposed that notoriety was acquired very slowly by any compositions in those times, opposed as Christianity was by almost all ; its professors often driven into concealment ; and confined, as it was, chiefly to a comparatively small body of Christians ; and promulgated with great caution, most probably, by them. (Burnside, pp. 201, 203.)

If, then, this be a literal day, all material considerations combine to restrict us to the *first day*, when Jesus rose from the dead, and rested in His perfected work of redemption. No other day, as the seventh was abolished with the Law, could answer with any propriety to the name, "*the Lord's day*."

It is *the first day* in the order of the new creation ; the dispensation of which actually began in the resurrection of Christ. *Time* enters into it no further than as inseparable from the duties of public and private worship, and ruled by existing providential circumstances in the Church, as the first assemblies late in the day prove ; and as it is a day of rest following six days of worldly occupations. The legal adjuncts necessarily vanished in the light and liberty of "*the Lord's day*" of mercy and love.

On the whole, then, we observe on this day *the holy rest of Jesus Christ*, the eternal and creative "Word of God," in His works of "the world to come."

We bow to the fulfilment of "the righteousness" of the great Passover feast.

On this day, as one body, we publicly confess Him to be our "Lord and our God !"—The Builder of the house,—Author of the new creation ; not alone its Foundation, Corner, and Top-stone, but the "Maker" of each lively stone in His Church ! We realize His presence in the midst of us ; and by faith inherit His peace, and receive His blessing. (Isa. li. ; 1 Peter ii. 4, 5.)

On this day, specially, we fulfil the righteousness of the law-feast of Pentecost ; and present ourselves, as "a kind of first-fruits of His creatures," unto God, the living "temples of the Holy Ghost." (Exod. xxxiv.

26 : N.B.) And thus, in dedicating the portion of man's life *originally* assigned to the worship of God, we honour and maintain a day consecrated by the Father, and by the Son, and by the Holy Ghost, combining in one harmonious strain "the song of Moses, and the Lamb."

The reader, who is acquainted with the "Seven Sermons" of the Bishop of Calcutta, will perceive a general resemblance to his conclusion in the page above; which is more remarkable, as the Author had not even heard of them until this book was written.

CHAPTER VIII.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

THE foundation on which an observance of the "Lord's day" is laid, by opponents of its "moral and divine obligation," is the authority of the Church. And this, it is affirmed, places the question "on a rock instead of the shifting sand." One passage in the Scriptures is deemed sufficient for an establishment of this point; viz., "the power of binding and loosing" delegated to the Church by its Head. (Matt. xvi. 19.)

This is not a novel opinion. It is held in the Roman Catholic Church. They say, "the Apostles altered the day without Scripture, or any commandment of Christ; such power God hath left to His Church." (Willett's Synops. Papismi., p. 499.) Considering the very early origin of an observance of this day among Christians, the subsequent establishment in that Church of appeal to *unwritten tradition*, and the decisive support imparted to this doctrine by resting a leading institution of God's worship upon this authority alone,

I can only say, that a removal of the question to such ground places it in very suspicious company with many others.

The passage before quoted has been long and much disputed, as to its precise bearing on the Church in its entire administration. No person can reasonably question that powers were conferred originally on the Church of Christ which were not intended to survive its earlier days. Any argument for their *permanence* throughout the Gospel dispensation,—*e.g.*, the miraculous powers still arrogated to itself in the Roman Catholic Church—would involve in it, to be consistent, more than any real Protestant can concede, and far more than can be proved to exist. It will be seen, I think, that the argument in question is exposed to this predicament. All the passages connected with the subject must be collated to obtain a clear and comprehensive view of the mind of the Spirit.

On the memorable occasion of Peter's confession of Christ, Jesus said, honouring the *revelation of the Father* more than His Apostle: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, *for* flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church ; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. xvi. 17—20.) "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. *Then charged He His disciples that they should tell no man that He was Jesus the Christ.*" This application is conveniently passed over by the Papists.

The *happiness*, for so the word might be rendered, consisted in the honour of being the depository, for the time, of the teaching and truth upon which the *Church* of Christ is built. To perpetuate this fundamental *truth*, Jesus changed His name; assigning one which ought never to be heard without reminding the hearer that *Christ* and His *truth*, and not any mere man or name which is a shadow, are the foundation on which the Church is built, and on which its safety from the powers of darkness depends. To imprint this on their minds, He recalls them to the truth which was uppermost in His own; and from which, as the Rock of Salvation, the waters of life proceed. (1 Cor. x. 4; Ps. lxxviii. 35; lxxxix. 26.)

Again: "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; and if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he shall neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man, and a publican." This is "*binding*" him. He is ejected out of the Church; denied fellowship in its ordinances with the members of Christ. When he repents, and is received, then he is *loosed* from the restraint. (2 Cor. ii. 3—11.) "Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever *ye* shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. xviii. 15—18.) *

* "A branded or noted person for the first offence was called Anathe, from Athen, a sign, (Dan. vi. 27); and he never approached nearer than four paces (2 Thess. iii. 14). The second

Offences against the Church, through the members one towards another, is the leading subject of the context. And their serious nature is marked by the price at which the least of the body was redeemed. (Verse 14.) The spiritual power of punishing all obstinate disturbers of its peace, is conferred on *the body at large*. (Verse 1.) The *occasion*, in this instance, arose in a subject which affected the interests of the *whole* Church; and to the *whole body*, therefore, the power of dealing with it is referred. (xxiii. 1—4.) In the twenty-fifth chapter (29, 30,) the same word is used, “bind him hand and foot,” &c., as to “the unprofitable servant.”

“Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.” (John xx. 21—23.) *This* has respect to offences *directly*, as the others had to those *indirectly* committed against God. Finally, “It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burthen than these necessary things,” &c. (Acts xv. 28.) The inferences from these passages are, I think, palpable and plain.

I. That peculiar and exclusive power was not conferred by our Lord on one Apostle more than another,

censure of the Jewish Church was expressed thus:—Anathe-Mar; or, Bitterly noted (Deut. xxvii. xxviii), perhaps delivered to Satan (1 Tim. x. 20). If a man did not listen to the Church, he was excommunicated, or twice cursed (Jude i. 12), by the words Anathe-Mar, Mar-Anathe.” (1 Cor. xvi. 22.)—PARALIPOMENA, Art. 865.

as this was assured to the whole body twice : once before, and once after, the resurrection.

Nor is it to be forgotten, that the discourse terminating in this gift of power to the body soon followed what had been said first to Peter, and arose in a strife about this very pre-eminence of one above another. (Matt. xviii. 1.) And it appears highly probable that this contention arose in an apparent preference of Peter on his confession, and of James and John with him, perhaps, at the transfiguration ; and of Peter, again, at the miracle performed through him in order to payment of the tribute. (xvii. 27.) Jesus *decided* the contention by placing on an equality the whole body. And yet such strong possession had this lust of power so deeply seated in the heart of the natural man taken of their minds, that this strife was renewed by the mother of James and John, to the disturbance of the whole body. (xx. 20, &c.)

II. This power does not appear to have any definite relation whatever to an enactment of *new laws* for the Church ; but to the maintenance of *existing* moral and religious duties, affecting God and our neighbour ; and the consequent right to Church membership ; the violation of which interfered with the peace of the Church, the honour of its Head, and its influence on mankind. And we have an illustration of this in St. Paul's directions to the Corinthian Church, although he were yet possessed of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit ; and again, in his delivery of *Hymeneus and Alexander to Satan* ; and its *effect* on the *body*, not on the *soul* ; and of its *object*, the *salvation* of offenders. The plain sense of the word "bind" pre-supposes an existence of something which is to be bound, or held

closely and safe. Thus it is in the absolution of sins. Remission is promised to repentance and faith. The duty and power of the Church are so to bind, and loose, that these prescribed conditions, or God's law in the promised pardon of sins, may be maintained in all its strength. Originally, these were *discerned* in the penitent whose pardon was, therefore, positively known, and had been granted, on God's part, before its revelation to the Apostles. Now, it is granted on repentance and faith, *declared* by the ministers of Christ, but known only to them as conditional on the communication of the grace of the Spirit to repent and believe; and so to admit to, or debar men from, fellowship with the ordinances and members of the Church. It implies, therefore, nothing beyond an exercise of that *administrative* power which is necessary to secure observance of existing laws. If Church legislation exceeded the laws recorded in the Scripture, or *vice versâ*, this would not be to *bind*, but to strangle, them; not to liberate the guiltless, but to connive at the impunity of offenders. By preaching, and through its effects on the faithful and unbelieving, the Church *binds*, and *looses*, in earth, and in heaven; but this is altogether within the limits prescribed in Scripture, which is the word preached, the instrument of faith. And the same is true, through her administration of the Sacraments. This is what appears to be St. Paul's meaning by "*governments*." (1 Cor. xii. 28.) In an exercise of this guiding and ruling power, so as to hold each member to *the law*, the depositaries of this are to the Church what the pilot is to the vessel, *viz.*, the *director* of that which is made ready to his hands. And the correctness of this view seems beyond a doubt, from the *principles* of her legis-

lative action being rigidly defined; *i.e.*,—by “decency, order, edification, peace, and the glory of God.” The power of “making and repealing laws” is, therefore, to be understood with this restriction. It is like the *bye-laws* of a corporate body, in relation to the laws of the land, which they can neither supersede nor invalidate. (Bloomfield Rec. Syn., vol. i., p. 219; vol. vi., 582.) She is, as observed by Bloomfield, *administrator* and *executor*, or *manager*. But to *legislate* and to *administer* laws, are distinct and different things. If, then, observance of a Sabbath be neither in its nature moral, nor prefer any divine and prescriptive claim in the Scriptures, then the bond whereby men are bound to its observance becomes weak indeed. (See our Art. xix., xx., xxi.)

Can its observance be then proved “necessary” or divine when Scripture is silent, and the Church is an *administrator* alone of holy writ? She could not bind to any observance of a Sabbath unless this be prescribed in the Scriptures. It is an easy thing to learn from the Epistles of St. Paul what was really intended in these Scriptures. We do not find there anything like a *discretionary* and *magisterial* power, to originate laws obligatory, *per se*, and *in foro conscientie*; *i.e.*, independently, and of themselves, and in conscience; like all inspired prescriptions of God. (1 Cor. v. 5—11; 1 Tim. i. 20.)

Assumption of this power would, necessarily, revive the old practices of Rome; and sanction the whole of her claims to miraculous powers, positive absolution, &c. Whilst original laws were to be enacted, the Church was under the direct and extraordinary power of the Holy Ghost, as well as when the meaning of such endowments was to be illustrated by apostolical examples; and whilst she was exercising the plenary powers of *absolu-*

tion and retention of sin, with its consequent penalties here. The cessation of that power is implicated in the cessation of extraordinary gifts, with a completion of the inspired canon of Scripture ; and of the other in the impossibility, but by inspiration, of “discerning” in the soul an existence of the indispensable conditions of pardon, and of knowing the *certain effect* of sentence denounced against offenders.

These extraordinary gifts having passed away, the power of *binding* and *loosing*, originally bestowed, necessarily assumes a qualified meaning. And thus the power of absolution becomes *declaratory*, not absolute ; and her legislative power extends to those *secondary* laws prescribed by “decency, order, edification, peace, and God’s glory ;” to carry out the *complete* and *primary* Christian code of truth dictated by the Holy Ghost. Whilst the gift of “discernment of spirits” survived, in the *remission, retention*, and punishment of sin ; and an infallible perception of what the real welfare of the Church, and not the cravings of human passion alone, required, the *voice of the Church was the voice of God* ; and of the last resort. But, destitute of this, she may, in any but a qualified sense, by pretensions to this power remit sin which God retains, and prescribe laws that seem good to her, or *bind* and *loose*, where it does not “seem good to the Holy Ghost.” *

I have mentioned examples in the apostolic age, as *illustrative* of the powers really conferred on the Church

* Her power to *bind* and *loose* is that which is a means of maintaining *each member* in his place, in subjection, relatively, both to the Head and to the *Body* ; ensuring unity to the whole, growth and perfection to every part. (Ephes. iv. 12). N.B.—*καταρτισμὸν*.

by its Head. To the church at Corinth St. Paul speaks thus : "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, *and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ : to deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.*" (1 Cor. v. 4, 5 ; see "Lord's Day," p. 266.)

In his second Epistle he says, "to whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also ; for, if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes (forgave I it) *in the person of Christ.*" (2 Cor. ii. 10, 11 ; Matt. xvi. 19 ; John xx. 19—23.) "Lest Satan should get," &c.

"Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." (1 Tim. i. 20.)

The case was personal and peculiar ; and the treatment was in accordance. If the Church still have the *same* power it must exist in the same way, throughout all its details. "When ye are gathered together, and my spirit."—"Went not my spirit with thee," said Elisha, "when the man turned again from his chariot to meet thee?"—"The power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh," &c., must also be there ! When *sentence* is given, it must be under sanction of somebody who can do it authoritatively, in "*the power of our Lord Jesus Christ :*" an evident allusion to the previous, extraordinary delegations of Jesus to the body of Apostles ; and "in the person of Christ !" And there must not be any doubt as to *the effect* in "the destruction of the flesh :" otherwise, were it innocuous, its effect would be to give impunity to offenders. And if, as in the case among the Corinthians, an offender professed "godly sorrow,"

—and which the Apostle knew to be real, but which now, in any case, might be feigned,—in an exercise of these supposed plenary powers she would minister to the same results. Impunity in sin would follow deceit. It is plain that its *reality* was “discerned” by St. Paul : so that he saw the necessity of comforting the offender, “lest he should be swallowed up with over much sorrow.” (2 Cor. ii. 7 ; vii. 5—16 ; Acts v. ; xiv. 9.) All this proves that these records illustrate an exercise of a temporary and extraordinary power. And, when we come to the consideration of the *general* and *permanent* powers of the Church, a plain and palpable distinction will be seen. Who could, scripturally, presume to maintain now *such a presence* of any man “in his spirit,” in “the power of Jesus Christ ;” and the personal, vicarious presence of the Head, thus represented in very person by His servant, in an authoritative, direct confirmation of the sentence of the Church, and in a positive declaration of an offender’s real grief for his sin ? Priests who profess to stand in their confessional *as God*, may do this ; and what is there to which men to whom “God has sent strong delusion, that they may believe a lie,” will not pretend ? But no enlightened Protestant will presume to wield in this way the rod of an apostle. It is plain that this power to *bind* and *loose* must be taken in its connected harmony with apostolical practice,—in its relation to facts peculiar to those days,—and an undeniable difference of Church administration in far the larger part of the Gospel dispensation. It appears very questionable if even the *Corinthians* had subsequently in all cases, precisely the same power : looking at St. Paul’s mode of expression, and the fact, that both an original direction of the procedure, and his

confirmation of their acts, alone completed the judgment. So long alone as the same powers survived could the same proceedings be taken.

It will be rejoined, probably, "Does not any of this power, then, remain in the Church?" Certainly not, in the precise and extraordinary sense of the original gift. She can excommunicate sinners, and exclude them from her ordinances: which appears to be the direction of our Lord. The Apostle's departure from this procedure clearly marks it as a temporary judicial act. The Apostles acted upon what the Spirit enabled them, specially and infallibly, to know and do both as to existing, and future exigencies in the Church; and a line of demarcation is plainly drawn between these cases, and those which were to be ruled by permanent provisions. Ecclesiastical enactments are now confined, as observed by Hooker, "to that which is not scandalous or offensive to any, especially unto the Church of God; all things in order, and with seemliness; all unto edification; finally, all to the glory of God." (Vol. i., p. 255.)

If *infallible* wisdom and supernatural power were needful when the Church was to be formed, and established in the face of the whole world's virulent opposition,—when the canon of Scripture was not completed, and, so far as it was written, difficult of access,—it does not follow, nor is it the fact, that the same necessity existed after the "whole counsel of God" had been both delivered and written. (Acts xx. 27.)

"Administration" in the Church is "by the same Spirit," and "the same Lord." We have His mind in His perfect revelation; which admits not of either "addition," or "diminution." (Deut. iv. 2; Rev. xxii. 18.) It is "the perfect will of God;" accessible to

every man, and open to all in the practical proof of their own experience of its completeness. (Rom. xii. 1 ; Prov. xxx. 1, 6. N.B.) The *general* promise of Jesus (Judas was not present when it was made,) to the Church, *viz.*, that *the Spirit* shall "guide" each true member "into all truth," ensures this. (John xiii. 30 ; John xvi. 7—13 ; 1 Cor. xi. 11—14.)

A difference of "administration" is both foretold and established by fact. (Eph. iv. 11—16 ; Acts vi. ; xxi. 8 ; 2 Tim. iv. 5.) "He gave some, apostles ; and some, prophets ; and some, evangelists ; and *some, pastors and teachers.*" The last, distinct, and permanent form of God's gifts to the Church is in that of "pastors and teachers." Their province is, evidently, to lead into and out of the fold, all classes to the food and rest provided already. This has been, therefore, God's ordinary mode of "administration" since the first ages of the Church ; and all beyond it, and not clearly resolvable into the general principles just named, is unauthorized pretension and usurpation.

For, whatever men may be scripturally in order, degree, and power, relatively to others of the body, yet this has been, and is, the common mode of general "administration." Each minister is a "pastor and teacher," even the highest ; and from the beginning. The Gentile Apostle, therefore, designates himself, "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ." (Titus i.) And he that covets any other distinction for itself, betrays an imperfect estimate of his real honour. So do not even the highest of "the principalities, and powers, in heavenly places." "I am Gabriel, that *stand* in the presence of God." A "servant" of Jehovah ! (Luke i. 19.)

Edification of the *whole body* has been secured by the

whole gracious and various arrangements, at appropriate times, from beginning to end. And, thus, there are “differences of administrations, but the same Lord ;” as well as “the same Spirit.” (1 Cor xii. 5.) But how could this be, were the same administrative forms of “apostles, prophets, evangelists,” with the same precise powers, still retained? Part of the divine arrangement is, indeed, “governments ;” but the principles are clearly limited and defined, as we have seen. (Verse 28.) And, hence, the Apostle moulds his exhortation of the whole Church in accordance: “Having, then, gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us,” &c. (Rom. xii. 4—8.) This *magisterial* authority, then, consequent on the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost bestowed at the beginning, exercised in initiatory laws, and miraculous powers, has, in their departure, necessarily passed away. No man, nor any body of men can now, in the same plenitude of knowledge and power, wield the “rod” of an apostle. (1 Cor. iv. 21.) The Church’s *authority* now is *ministerial* alone ; that of the handmaid of the Lord,—the Spouse of Christ. Her power over the body is referrible to the sacred canon of Holy Writ ; to “the mind of Christ.” It is determined by this ; and those general principles of natural truth, scriptural analogy, and charity, already named. The “*ultima ratio*” of the Church still remains as of old : “to the law, and to the testimony,” &c. The will of the Bridegroom is her sole rule ; and must be the measure both of right and wrong in her laws, even when these are framed on the general principles laid down, candidly and rationally understood. She is “a witness and keeper of Holy Writ.” (Article XX., Book of Common Prayer.)

Wherefore, Jesus Christ asserts His *exclusive* prerogative and right :—"I am He that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell, and of death. These things saith He that is holy, and He that is true; He that hath the key of David; He that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth." *To this accords the mind of our Reformers*, reflected in Art. XX. (Rev. i. 18; iii. 7; Isa. xxii. 20—25; Matt. xxv. 1—13.)

If the moral and Divine obligation of "the Lord's day" could not be scripturally sustained, it would be still a very grave question if the Church have any power to ordain a Sabbatical ordinance, in the place of one appointed unquestionably by God Himself, when this had been undeniably abolished with His law. The power claimed is not, and cannot be, on the ground stated, because of "order, decency, harmlessness, edification, and the glory of God;" but as power derived immediately from Jesus Christ, and as *binding* on the conscience, like *remission* and *retention of sin*; declaratory of an existing law, the existence of which, directly from God, is yet emphatically denied. If her power did, indeed, extend thus far, then must it, *a fortiori*, be absolute in inferior matters, and beyond appeal. Who could then assign any limits? We all know to what extremes an assumption of this power has been carried in the Church of Rome. It would, indeed, be a bold step of the Church, having seen an abrogation of the only day ever prescribed by God as it is said, to ordain another day of the same nature and essence. If the Church did this then, she did more than was ever done by her before or since; for nobody will contend, I suppose, that an observance of Good Friday, &c., stands precisely

on the same ground as an observance of "the Lord's day;" nor even in strict analogy with the Mosaic *Sabbaths* as contrasted with *the seventh day*:—for those were prescribed by God Himself.

Observance of Good Friday is commemorative of the sacrifice of the true Passover Lamb, and of the institution of "the Lord's Supper," the *body* of the Jewish shadow. And on this day, moreover, there was a fulfilment of one of the leading Mosaic types of redemption from sin; and which, if not virtually prescribed as a solemn fast day to the Church, yet must be placed in the very next rank to an ordinance of Divine appointment. As *that* was analogous to the sacrifices offered from the beginning, giving them point and plainness, so those were not, like the Sabbath, laid in the foundation of the natural Church, before sin entered at all. On the same ground that Mosaic festivals were denominated *Sabbaths*, *i.e.*, because of the same general nature, this first day's holy observance, even on the reason assigned, cannot be divested of a sabbatizing nature. And it brings the Church into the dangerous predicament of usurping the prerogative of God, as He alone can authoritatively declare *what*, as well as "*who*, is holy."

If a day of holy rest be not authoritatively prescribed to us now in the Scriptures, neither are the duties proper to the day. In this case, then, either endless diversity, confusion, and contention would prevail, or the Church go much further—and nobody but the Church could say how far—into details of its duties. Otherwise, an unbridled license would reign among her members as of old, where the will of man was asserted to be the law. (1 Cor. xiv. 26, 40.) And hence, when immediate access to God ceased, as at the beginning; and when what

had been free and natural to man in religion, became bondage and constraint to his spirit ; when tradition became obscure, and "scanty records" were lost ;—the Lord, prescribing the holy day, prescribed also to Israel its leading duties.

Again : the power of the Church to *loose* is equal to her power to *bind*. If, then, she had authority to prescribe this day for worship, she has authority likewise to alter it, or to abolish it altogether. It might happen, therefore, that she would prohibit its observance as a holy rest, or as a religious festival, or ordain another in its place. If sabbatarianism were to prevail, and become the creed of the majority, what could hinder a legitimate return to the seventh day Sabbath ? And who could fairly question such an appointment on this ground, claiming, too, the more weighty sanction of an original, immutable prescription ? For the Sabbatarian would not demand its observance on the lower ground of Church authority alone, as he would esteem it merely a return to a duty which ought not to have been abandoned.

The passage in Justin, so far as it avails at all, is, in my mind, a proof of the religious observance of Sunday, and that on the ground of personal direction by Jesus Christ. And I see that this very construction has been assigned to this father's account of Sunday by Willett ("Synopsis Papismi," p. 497.):—

"1. When they are come together, the writings of the Apostles and Prophets are read.

"2. Then the president, or pastor, exhorteth the people to the imitation of that which they heard.

"3. Then follow prayers.

"4. Then, *panis offertur, et vinum, et aqua*,—the bread, and wine, and water, is offered to them.

“5. And, lastly, a contribution is made by the richer sort to the poorer.”

It is the *facts* alone with which we are concerned. These would not be affected even if they substantiate one custom prescribed in Scripture as to alms, and another as to introduction of water like the Popish innovation of mixing water with the wine in the Lord's Supper. He quotes also the testimony of Athanasius, A.D. 326, to an existence of the same custom in his day, and other witnesses to the same practice in the Ethiopic Church, the Confession of Helvetia, and a Constitution of the Synod of Basil.

“On the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun, having appeared to the apostles and disciples, He taught them the things we now submit to your consideration.” (Pp. 128, 129.) This agrees with the account in the first chapter of Acts, particularizing, in the very first age of the Gospel, what is generally narrated in that inspired record. But what is the conclusion of “The Modern Sabbath Examined?” “There is no mention, it is to be observed, of the transference of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first, or the sanctification of the latter day, in obedience to the prescriptions of the Decalogue.”

Nor was there any need. Justin could not but know, as his opinion of the ground of observing a Sabbath proves, be this right or wrong, that a day of holy rest had existed before the Mosaic institutions. And he knew, doubtless, both the peculiarity of its prescription to Israel, and its abrogation in this sense, in common with the Mosaic system.

But there is an express ascription of these observances mentioned by Justin to the *teaching of Christ*, who “did

not come to destroy, but to fulfil the law ;” consequently, of its fulfilment in this particular, of the natural truth involved in the seventh day of Moses ; and of its *virtual* transference to the first day’s holy rest. Nor is it likely that he would expose an obligation to its observance to the suspicion that the fourth commandment contained the sole and original prescription, by passing the primitive institution in assigning the duty to the Decalogue ; abrogated when he wrote so far as of the Mosaic law. And, were this transference undisputed in his day, why should he be expected to do what was needless ? His silence about a holy observance of the *seventh day*, with a positive ascription of what was done on the *first day* to the teaching of Christ, at His appearance to the Church on this day, not only excludes *the seventh* from any religious consideration, but gives a leading importance to this one day, thus celebrated and distinguished by those “who were always together ;” and it leaves the original ground of sabbatical observance, anterior to the Decalogue, untouched.

Justin does not notice the prescription in the Decalogue, nor yet that at the Creation. But he does much more ; for he considers the analogy to exist between the *first day* of the *natural*, and that of the *spiritual*, creation, when *life and immortality* were “brought to light by the Gospel,” in the resurrection of Jesus ; and thus reposes its obligation in *natural truth*, the very principle and essence of things, as immutable and moral. “But we meet together on Sunday, because it is the first day, in which God, having wrought the necessary change in darkness and matter, made the world ; and on this day Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead.” (Mod. Sabb. Exam., p. 129.)

The silence of Justin about any holy observance of the seventh day ought to be, in its degree, conformably to the same author's own rule, "certain proof of the unscriptural nature and authority of any such practice." (P. 127.)

"The Apostles," says Willett, "did not abrogate the Jewish Sabbath, but Christ Himself by His death, as He did also other ceremonies of the law; and this the Apostles knew both by the Scriptures, the word of Christ, and His Holy Spirit.

"They did not appoint a new Sabbath of their own authority; for, first, they knew by the Scripture that one day of seven was to be observed for ever," &c. (P. 499.)

I cannot but consider the reference to Justin a most infelicitous one by an opponent of the first day. Happily the moral and immutable duty stands firm on the rock of eternal truth, independent both of fathers and sons.

If this power be arrogated to the Church, and our Sabbath be laid upon this basis alone, surely some *decrees* of the Church ought to be produced, and at a very early period in her career. This is importunately demanded to justify its observance, in the earliest ages, on *scriptural* grounds; and, surely, it is much more needful to justify its observance on lower and *ecclesiastical* grounds. It must, otherwise, take the rank of an unwritten tradition.

The *Papist* has adopted the tactics of the *Jew*, to support his unscriptural tenets. The *Jew* says, "he that has learned the Scriptures, and not the Mishna, is a blockhead." And Bellarmine says, "the Scriptures are not necessary at all, nor sufficient without tradition." ("De Verbo Dei non Scripto," l. 4, c. 5; Sibson, Letter

xviii. p. 4.) And it is a very subtle device of Rome to found or support her doctrine of tradition on such an ancient and undeniable practice of the Church as a holy observance of Sunday. Nor would it be easy, having given her this fulcrum, to resist the force of her arguments against an exclusive authority of Holy Writ.

But the very *dogma* of the Roman Catholic Church, that obligation of "the Lord's day" rests on *Church authority* alone, known in this case only by tradition, implies a previous and competing question at issue with this notion, and assigning it to a direction of God. And when we behold the tenacity with which that Church adheres to numerous and needless austerities, I cannot but look suspiciously at the license permitted to her members on this holy day. (Bp. Calcutta's Sermon.)

Should it be said, that an institution by the Church is to be inferred from *the fact* of its very early observance, I reply, it is more legitimate to look to the body of Scriptural testimony on the subject, leading us to ascribe its institution to Jesus Christ Himself; fulfilling all the righteousness of this institution; to His exposition of the *necessity* "that He should rise again *on the third day*," on this particular day; which must have been, therefore, foreseen, and prescribed as "the eighth," or first and presentation day of the real "first-fruits of them that slept;" and from *the fact* of uninterrupted sanctification of the *first day* alone, under the guidance of inspired persons.

If the *silence* of the Church may be fairly considered as an authoritative sanction of *the first day*, when that silence might arise in other and opposing reasons; whilst the *examples* of Apostles, &c., are to be held in no regard whatever; then acquiescence of *the Head* of

the Church, even for two hundred years, must much more implicate His approval and prescription. Dr. Owen, in his work on the Hebrews, makes some just and strong remarks on the certainty that Christ would never leave His Church in such a capital error from the beginning. The *fact* of observance from the introduction of the Gospel is not to be questioned. "I should hold it too long," says Bishop Andrews, "to cite them in particular; I avow it on my credit, that there is not an ecclesiastical writer in whom it is not to be found." (Bishop of Calcutta's 4th Sermon, p. 110.) If the *ground* of obligation had been questioned, complete and explicit statements of the arguments might have been found. It is rather too much to convert a general unquestioned assent to the Divine origin of this observance into an opposing argument, when, two hundred years ago, the more ancient opinion of "the Lord's day," in opposition to this among all the other corrupt novelties of the Church of Rome (and which necessarily implicates a previous and conflicting sentiment,) was not then *originated*, but *revived*. The same argument, in effect, has been used by the Romish Church against evangelical truths, stigmatized as *novelties* by her; assigning their origin to the Protestant Church at the Reformation.

"The Modern Sabbath Examined" ascribes the prevalent opinion to mere "assumptions," founded upon "a misconception of the nature and design of certain religious customs that obtained during the second and third centuries. That Sunday was observed as a day of religious rejoicing as early as the time of *Tertullian*, is abundantly manifest." (P. 121, 122. A.D. 192.)

But, whilst this was said in 1832, the ground of the

first day's observance "at the close of the second century," be it observed, is reposed on a father who apostatized and became a heretic, and who testifies to "the custom of praying for the dead as common in the second century," with other *workings* of the Romish corruption. The Bishop of Calcutta, too, had, in 1831, addressed his Seven Sermons to his flock, as a "new year's token of sincere regard for their welfare!" It has been said truly of Tertullian, that his heresy "has cast a shade over all his works;" but which, yet, hold a first rank among the Latins. In his fourth sermon, Bishop Wilson quotes *Ignatius'* (p. 110. A.D. 101) opinion: ("A Companion of the Apostles,") "let us no more sabbatize, but let us keep the Lord's day, on which our life arose." In what sense this early father understood the first day is too plain for comment. His exhortation implicates a transference of the Mosaic Sabbath; observance of a Christian Sabbath; and this on the first day when "Christ, who is our life," rose from the dead. "The Modern Sabbath Examined" observes again: "if the doctrine of the transference to the first day of the week, of the duties of the fourth commandment, had been taught by the Apostles, we should naturally expect to find some recognition of these duties in the records of Christian antiquity." (P. 127.)

The omissions in the fathers are not, as seen, a ground on which any argument can be safely reposed; for, in any case, there cannot be had a positive certainty of the fact of omission. The testimony of *Ignatius* is, however, direct and plain. And, if the common sentiment were identical with that father's, we cannot look for "recognition" of what was not questioned. But, in truth, no certain result can be anticipated from any argument

derived from the fathers. Ignatius' Epistles may be spurious, as well as Polycarp's, as observed. A forty day's, and a Sabbath fast, are most severely enjoined as apostolical. The *probability* seems to be that they are their works, but interpolated and adulterated. It would be an arduous undertaking to draw off the pure element from a muddy pool.

The opinions of some of our reformers were not at once cleared of the mystifying obscurities of Romish corruption. We can only walk with Cranmer, or any man, so far as he follows the straight line of the Scriptures. As to the Lord's Supper and other things, we know that he slowly emerged out of the darkness of Roman apostacy into the clear light of Protestant truth. When we see that not *one* fundamental truth of the Gospel has escaped corruption in that communion of Satanic darkness and delusion, it is only matter of thankfulness to the God of all grace, that such light was poured upon the minds of our reformers ; and of prayer that all their successors in our Church might see more nearly, eye to eye, with those great and good men.

Were "the Lord's day" prescribed by Apostles for the sake of "order" alone, still its authority would be Divine. The appointment of the Church in our *offertory*, to be read on "the Lord's day," is indirect testimony of the general opinion of the compilers of the Liturgy as to the apostolical origin of *oblations* at the Communion on "the Lord's day."

Non-observance of the seventh day as holy in the time of Justin, (A.D. 150,) agitation of the Sabbatarian question which is said to have prevailed at the end of the third, and in the fourth centuries, *i.e.*, doubtless,

whether or not the *seventh* should be added to the first day's holy observance, appear to leave the latter custom unquestioned by either party. (Burnside.)

The rise of *sabbatarianism* in its milder form was, in apostolical times, as we have seen. This was not then *exclusive*, but *retentive*, of the first day's observance. Nay, we have seen, in the Apostle Paul's history, that the reverse was the fact, in an exclusion of a seventh day's holy worship among Christians. And his assertion of the body of Mosaic ordinances, "that they are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ," is an answer both as to the seventh day sabbath, and all other things of Mosaic institution.

The very early and constant observance of "the Lord's day" is, in itself, a strong presumptive argument for its Divine origin. The testimony of Ignatius, and others subsequent, might be added, is positive as to the ground of the custom in apostolical times ; whilst that of Justin, about fifty years later than those days, substantiates both the fact and reason ; whilst it is descriptive of a complete service for the worship of God, renders another apostolical direction unquestionable in connection with that day, and testifies to an establishment of this observance in the Church. The meeting at Troas, and St. John's denomination of the day, are proofs, I think, amounting to both the "precept and example," demanded, as "a part of those things which Christ commanded." ("Modern Sabbath Examined," p. 114.)

"The most certain token of evident goodness is, if the general persuasion of all men do so account it. And, therefore, a common-received error is never utterly overthrown, till such times as we go from signs

to causes, and show some manifest root or fountain thereof common to all, whereby it may clearly appear how it hath come to pass that so many have been overseen. In which case, surmises and slight probabilities will not serve, because the universal consent of men is the perfectest and strongest of this kind, which comprehendeth only the signs and tokens of goodness." (Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, vol. i., p. 144.)

"I dispute not," says Owen, "of what the Church may appoint, for good order's sake, to be observed in religious assemblies. But this I dare say, confidently, that no church, nor churches, not all the churches in the world, have power, by common consent, to ordain anything in the worship of God, as a part of it, which God had once ordained, commanded, and required; but now, under the Gospel, ceaseth so to do, as circumcision and sacrifices." (On *Heb.*, vol. ii., p. 369.)

The precise power of the Church in an administration of her affairs, and that part especially which concerns the worship of God, so as to promote, by doctrine and discipline, the profit of her members, is a subject at once important, interesting, and difficult.

Men have, as usual, proceeded in this matter either to an extreme of tyranny on the one hand, or of license on the other. The New Testament propounds general principles and rules alone for the guidance of the Church, purposely abstaining from those minute details which characterized the Mosaic economy. And this has been perverted, unhappily, to an occasion of strife. Some, who perceived these leading principles and directions, have insisted on something—and, in certain cases, on everything—besides; or have pleaded for an absolute restriction to the bare letter of the Scriptures. Thus

Hooker combats the general rule, "that nothing can be justified in the Church that is not found in the Scriptures," *i.e.*, in a plain and literal sense. And they who could not, or would not, see even leading and essential points, have so diluted them as to annihilate all *literality*, if this expression may be allowed; or they have repudiated these directions altogether, abandoning themselves to a supernatural guidance which we are not authorized to expect.

"There is such a thing as a Church; there is such a thing as 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven;' there is such a thing as doing 'all things decently, and in order;' there is such a thing as 'submitting ourselves to those who have the rule over us;' there is such a thing as 'rejecting a heretic, after the first or second admonition;' there is such a thing as a 'false Apostle.'" The same good and able man says again, "Liberality, in the proper sense, I love; but indifference, disorder, negligence of Scripture, I would shun and avoid." (Bishop of Calcutta's 7th Sermon.)

The same evils and abuses have occurred in relation to the ecclesiastical polity of the Church, and the civil polity of the kingdoms of the world. Wherever men, discontented with the general principles and rules of Holy Writ in these things, have attempted to combine a mixed system, as intimate in its ecclesiastical and temporal relations as that of Moses, they have commonly so attenuated it by minute, needless, impolitic, not to say unscriptural, details,—that power, numbers, wealth, unsanctified talent, superstitious bigotry, and intolerance of free thought, have overlaid liberty, and corrupted the truth, in the greater portion of the visible Church, at different times.

What, then, is the general summary directive to an exercise of "governments" in the Church? *Appointment of depositories* of supervisory power in the Church, to secure unity of the faith, and peace. *Exclusion* of the weaker sex, as authoritative instructors. The *selection* and *mission* of ministers. The *probation* and *advancement* of inferior teachers and administrators. *An exclusion of heretics*, and offenders against morals. *Public exposure* of schismatics. *Description of the general character, duties, office, and consideration* due to Church rulers. *An assertion* of the power of the whole Church over its elders, and the rule by which its judgment, and sentence of them, must be guided; and, as implicated in this, surely, some voice of *the body* in an appointment of elders. Reference of these directions, as *imperative and permanent*, to the prescription of the Lord. These constitute nearly the whole Gospel code of administrative law. (1 Tim. iii. 14, 15; i. 3, 4, 19; ii. 9—13; 1 Cor. xi. 1—13; 1 Tim. v. 24, 25; iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6; ii. 2; Titus i. 5—9; Acts xiv. 23; 1 Tim. iii. 9, 10, 13⁵; Titus iii. 10, 11; Matt. xviii. 15—18; 1 Cor. v. 1—13; Acts vi. 2; 1 Tim. v. 9; Phil. iv. 3; Rom. xvi. 1; Luke viii. 3, Greek Testament; 1 Tim. v. 4, 9, 10, 19, 20, 21; vi. 13; Acts xv. 23.)

If to these, St. Paul's general directions to the Corinthian Church be added, as to *prayer*, the holy communion, singing, and those general principles of natural truth, and of reason, arising in the detailed prescriptions, we have the substance of inspired directions.

These things appear ample as an outline for the government, unity, and peace of the Church; but far too general to sanction that minute prescription, long and erroneously supposed indispensable to her *unity in*

the Spirit, and the bond of peace. Uniformity of spirit and truth is to be secured, not in exact uniformity of *letter* alone, but in faithful dependence on the promised *presence* of Jesus, the guidance of His Holy Spirit, and the general analogy and direction of His infallible word.

And whilst there is precision enough in this to condemn all laxity and license resolvable into the supremacy of private judgment, yet, even in this way, many things must be looked for which will demand an exercise of meekness, love, and forbearance, among her members, with a sincere regard to the leadings of Providence. (Phil. iii. 15, 16, N.B.)

We may be well satisfied in our own Church, upon the whole, with the supremacy of the Protestant crown ; the appointment of our Bishops ; and the general system of existing patronage of her livings. *Principles* are maintained. The spirit and providence of God have worked among us a great amount of good ; but men of any forecast may discern, in “the shadows which coming events cast before them,” that the potential check which the body of the people has exerted in our political constitution, is to be both anticipated and desired, by a larger infusion of the lay element into our ecclesiastical arrangements, and which the spirit of the times has actually evoked.* However, let it be our confidence that “the Lord reigneth.”

* We have the *principle* of right preserved to our laity in Church affairs, in both Houses of Parliament. But whether this can very consistently include “Jews, Turks, infidels, and heretics,” as our laity, does not appear plain. That Collect is used during the assembly of Parliament ; and it might serve to remind us of such an anomalous constitution, and give a point to the prayer not to be desired.

But, in arrogating to the Church a power which has not been conferred by our Head, she is not only involved in profane intrusion on "those things which belong unto the Lord," but enters upon a path of which we cannot see any termination, and which has led, hitherto, to an extreme of tenacity to *little things*; to a violation of that meekness and charity which cling chiefly to the broad principles of God's truth, in the spirit of the freedom of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Church is not the *mistress*, but "the ground and pillar of the truth:" its *depository*, and *herald*, in the pilgrimage to promised rest, exaltation, and glory. (1 Tim. iii. 11; Rom. iii. 1; Rev. xii.)

It is "the household of faith;" faith is of the Word; and the Word of the Holy Ghost. In this sense and mode, then, she will be guided into all necessary truth, propriety, order, edification, to the glory of her Head, and the peace of her children. (1 Cor. ii. 13—16.)

On the whole, then, it is evident that the general principles of truth and order, derived from original, natural law, and the primary revelations of God to man, transmitted after the Fall chiefly by tradition, and through ceremonial institutions, so far as necessary to the general knowledge and hope of man's ultimate restoration to the favour of God, characterized the Church from the fall to the call of Abraham.

This state exhibited in contrast, from the beginning, both the liberty forfeited by sin, and an impossibility of its restoration but by grace.

And, after the call of Abraham, this was illustrated by the striking allegory of the bond-woman and the free, with their respective seeds.

The difficulties attendant on this dispensation, as to

spiritual ends, in man's *renewal after the image* of God, may be seen in the early narrative of events in the Church until the Deluge ; and where sabbatical observances are to be plainly traced ; in the confusion of tongues, to frustrate the vain hopes of ambitious sinners ; and in the series of preternatural means to preserve the knowledge and worship of God. This at length terminated in the institution of the Mosaic Church, dispensation, and sabbath,—after a recognition of sabbatical obligation on original grounds.

The character of obscurity was, however, still maintained. Truth was involved in dark shadows, and burdensome ceremonies ; illumined faintly, from time to time, by revelations from the mouth of the Lord ; and in which the Sabbath is distinctly *prominent* in its moral and permanent obligation.

This general obscurity is a significant memorial of the effect of sin on the original light of the Spirit in the soul of man, and the worship of God.

At last, however, the nearest possible approach was made to the primæval light and freedom of the Church, and worship of God. And we do not, perhaps, appreciate fully the effects of that sentence, “ *There shall no man see me, and live !* ” (Exod. xxxiii. 20.) Nor yet, possibly, the marvellous privilege graciously *restored* in Christ, so as to cultivate it sedulously, in our personal experience to all its practical extent, *viz.*, “ Truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ.” (1 John i. 3.) What a fulness of heavenly “ consolation ” in Christ, and extent of personal holiness, in the knowledge and love of God, and of conformity to His image, is forfeited in this way !

But, as institution of sacrifices, representative of the

general interest of man in the covenant of redemption, *preceded* those provisions which the Lord devised to secure the knowledge of His truth in the world, so, before one step was taken in legal enactments, exclusively Mosaic, the *Sabbath* was *foreshadowed* to the Church as surviving that system. She was then standing on the very confines of Egyptian bondage, and receiving the figurative representation of man's renewal to "life and immortality" by the bread which cometh down from heaven. And this ultimate perfection and everlasting peace were united, as inseparable from holy sabbatizing in, and with the Lord ; as at "the foundation of the world," "when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." (Job xxxviii. 7.)

And, whilst both the continuance and transference of a holy rest, in the Church's transition out of the circumscribed limits of one country and people into the "large place" provided for her of God, are foretold ; and the very act and day significantly indicated ; so, with a "marvellous" precision, this New Moon and attendant Sabbath took, in tranquil majesty, that place predicted in the spiritual firmament, assigned to them of old by the hand and counsel of the Lord.

It appears consistent, that the Gospel Church should rest in the natural necessity of worship as to the general duty ; on God's original prescription as to the portion of time ; on a *fulfilment* in *the Lord's day* of the righteousness of that great festival established on the very opening of the grave of mystical bondage ; its *recognition* in the provision of the spiritual food of the Church ; on *the analogy*, at the giving of that Law which was audibly promulgated by God Himself, with its covenant

sign, as the bond of unity in all the moral duties towards God and man; harmonizing together as one the truth involved in the work and rest of nature by God the Father, with the work and rest of grace by God the Son. And all these, solemnly sanctioned by the *presentation* and blessing of our Head, His *first* personal act after resurrection, in the midst of His Church as the real "first fruits;" repeating this public sanction of the assembly of the Church on "the eighth day," once more, and for the last time personally, on this day of the week; and, finally, consecrating and sanctifying His Church and holy day, by the visible descent of the Holy Ghost. These things, with the mass of collateral testimony in the facts and arguments adduced, establish the divine and moral obligation of "the Lord's day" as a holy rest on solid grounds.

A few topics now remain to be noticed, which opponents have introduced, and which could not be appropriately considered in the progress of this statement.

Although "Moses did not write for the instruction and obedience of Adam," yet it appears highly probable that Adam was himself instructed, and others subsequent to his day, to record those foundations of human duty which Moses was divinely directed to preserve for the "admonition" of the Church even to the end. Nor is it to be denied, that the rule of human duty is one from beginning to end. (Gen. iii. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 3; Heb. ii. 5—9.) The record of Moses, then, bore an impress of its common relation to Adam in his day, and in him to all his seed. "By faith we understand that the world's were made." (xi. 3.) The narrative of creation, in *all* its parts, is presented as the common subject of faith to the church. The same might be said, and with

no better reason, of other inspired productions in relation to those who had preceded their authors in the Church. The whole law of nature, under which Adam stood at the first, remains in its original obligation on all his seed ; and all are involved in the penalties of its transgression. And hence, the whole narrative bearing relation to all in him, this record of Moses had an original relation to his “faith and obedience,” even if it were wholly written after his day. (Rom. vii.)

2. Both the *precepts* and the *doings* of God enter into the rule of human duty.

Is this not one of those ends for which they have been revealed ? Man’s original and regenerated nature are expressive of “the image of God ;” are a “walking with God.” And hence the rest of God on the seventh day is assigned as the very reason of its separation and ordination for the sacred observance of the man. (Eph. v. 1, 2 ; 1 Pet. v. 6 ; Matt. v. 44—48.) What else does the Gentile apostle mean when saying, “be ye, therefore, followers of God, as dear children ?”

3. It is characterised as “preposterous to seek information regarding the rule of human duty in the scanty records of Genesis.”

Did not St. Paul repair to them for some of the most eminent instances of devotion and obedience to God, and with the very purpose of imparting a knowledge of the *principle*, or rule, by which His people had walked ? Of the very first who is named he declares expressly, that “he, being dead, yet speaketh.” The mere action of a man, not declaratory of its principle or rule, would be solely a mechanical and inoperative representation. How is the example of Jesus to be “followed” but in a regard to the *principle* which regulated it

altogether, the will of God, leading to the cultivation of a like spirituality, disinterestedness, and devotion, by the grace and power of the Holy Spirit? (1 Pet. ii. 21.) And thus, as Enoch "walked with God, and had this testimony that he pleased God," so it is said of the whole, "these all obtained a good report through faith." And what is that in which faith arises, grows, and is established, but the "perfect will of God," followed in active cultivation of holiness. "For, whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother." (Mark iii. 35.) "Doing the will of God from the heart." (Eph. vi. 6.) "He that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." (1 John ii. 17.) "This is the will of God, even your sanctification." And all the real servants of God "walk by faith, and not by sight." (Rom. xii. 2; Heb. xi. 5—39; 2 Cor. v. 7.)

It is important to identify the rule of human duty as one and the same from the beginning. At the first it was a walk with God in unsinning obedience. And to this all men, in the first man, are naturally bound. But, as this is become a manifest impossibility to him who is "conceived and born in sin," so, since man's transgression, it has been a "walk with God" by faith in the perfect satisfaction and obedience of the second Head, through "the Spirit of life," regenerating and renewing the soul by His indwelling presence and power. So that now man, restored in Him, may come from the treasury of His fulness laden with the spiritual riches of grace, and say, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me."

It is a principle of universal truth both that "all Scripture is inspired of God, and is profitable." We

cannot, with the Papists, say, "it is *all true*," but, "it is not all *the truth*." Nor, with the Socinian, "it is true, but, not all true." It is by the truth of Scripture, as *a whole*, that man spiritually lives, and is *thoroughly* "furnished." Part of this profit and of this life must be impaired, necessarily, by any detraction from the whole, or by any human addition. Is it said that the church has not always had the completed whole now possessed, and yet her members did both *live* and *profit*? She had what *God* gave her, and not man; and what God could and did supernaturally, like the manna, render sufficient. No human wisdom can supply the deficiency with which power, and subtilty, might afflict the Church: nor any human means repair its mischief. And hence, the solemn warning against any diminution or addition, in both Testaments; for, what applies to one portion is applicable to the whole. (Hooker, E. Pol., Vol. 1., p. 259.) It is, *as a whole*, "in itself, absolute, exact, and perfect." It is to be feared that a very imperfect estimate is made of the responsibility which is attached, in the sight of God, to the depositories of His Truth. (Rom. iii. 2.) In the undisturbed possession of this, its acknowledged sufficiency as the foundation of the Church of Christ; the power, facilities, and avowed duty of the possessors to disseminate it "among all nations;" we trace the footsteps of Providence, selecting our country as the chosen repository of "the oracles of God." And woe will be to us, I believe, if we preserve not untouched this Ark of our strength!

And it may deserve consideration whether or not the prohibition, "thou shalt not make to thyself," or, "according to thy own imagination," be not of *universal application*; including not alone *sensible* representations,

(and what is truth but the representation of God ?) but all things falsely, because defectively, representative of God. It includes all mutilations of the Bible great and small.

So far, then, from casting *away* the Old Testament in an enquiry as to the nature and obligation of "*the Lord's day*," or, in any other matter connected with the worship of God, and, therefore, with the duty of man, we must have *the whole*, to arrive at any safe and satisfactory result. And it is, indeed, ample reason to suspect any system which would exclude any part of the sacred volume.

This appears especially true when done on the puerile pretext, "that the part is better than none !" The justification that satisfies many in relation to the system of public education in Ireland !

But, election is to be made not between a part, or none whatever. This is a *Roman Catholic* alternative ; and an awful one it is ! Their principle is denial of access to the Scriptures. The legitimate offspring of this is access to part alone of the Scriptures. And the child bears the lineaments of the parent. For, if the Church has a right to exclude any portion, she has a right to exclude the whole. However, some persons accept and adopt this ! By *Protestants*, the choice is to be made between *the whole*, or *the part*. And this election is made on a supposed, but fictitious, necessity in the case. The whole is to be *obtained*. The sufficiency of *the whole* alone is the foundation of Protestantism ! (Art. vi. Church of England.)

God says, in effect, "Lo ! I have given to you my '*whole counsel*,' and will. Cursed is he that addeth to it, or taketh away !" (Heb. i. 1 ; Rev. xxiii.)

We cede this rock of might! We do it to a declared and open foe, whose *real* desire, judged by all past and present knowledge, is *entire* exclusion where it can be effected! Some persons, indeed, would repudiate all the lessons of past experience; as others, in the plenitude of their own conceit, would consign all history to the region of useless lumber, as “an *old almanack!*” They forget that this, again, becomes true. Solomon speaks to such persons in vain. Some are puffed up with conceit in the supposed superiority of their *novelties*; others imagine unheard-of excellencies under the dust of ages! “*Is there anything whereof it may be said, See, THIS IS NEW?*” inquires the wise man. And again, “*Say not then the FORMER days were better than THESE.*” (Eccles. i. 9; vii. 10.)

To sit down deliberately and wilfully contented with a *portion* of that which God has considered necessary as an un mutilated *whole*, denouncing His curse on all who act in opposition to this, is not alone presumptuous transgression of His solemn prohibitions, but pusillanimous surrender of a leading Protestant principle, *the sufficiency of the whole Scriptures* alone! It is a *practical* adoption of one purely Popish! A tacit admission that *the Church* can supply the place of the part excluded! This is usurpation of the seat and throne of God! It is not, of course, seen by those who are parties to the deed. But the nature and consequences of men’s actions do not flow solely out of their *intentions*. “*Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth.*”

I have now brought this inquiry to a close. I hope there is not anything in it to inflict pain, or excite angry feelings in any human being, as such a result would be far from my design. It has been conducted

under many disadvantages, in the midst of deep private trials, which interest in the subject has tended much to assuage. I cannot but be conscious of numerous defects, notwithstanding every effort. There is an enumeration of books on this subject of the Gospel rest in Bishop Wilson's Pastoral Address, prefixed to his Seven Sermons. If it had been possible to procure an access to them, I should have considered it a duty to consult them all. But I have had to pursue the subject with the Bible in my hand, availing myself of such slender resources as were in my possession. It has been an arduous task. No pains, it may be believed, have been spared; for the manuscript has been written over five times, repeatedly perused, and thrice revised—finally for the press. My *endeavour* has been, I trust, to maintain a single eye to the truth; the glory of the God of all truth; and the satisfaction of all sincere lovers of the truth. I now commit it to the God of all grace for His blessing; and to all the partakers of His grace, for their charitable consideration and acceptance. And may He who graciously accepted the mite cast into the treasury of the temple, acknowledge this humble offering to the treasury of the truth of God!

FINIS.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR (THE REV. T. BROOKE, M.A.,)

Dedicated to the Most Noble the Marquis of Cholmondeley,

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION

NOT THE

Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures,

NOR OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Demy 12mo., neat cloth, price 3s.

"This little book is sent forth neither for strife nor fame; but, in humble hope that the Lord may be pleased to own it, as he did the widow's mite, for good to His Church."—*Preface.*

This book will be sent post-free to any part of the kingdom by Messrs. Binns and Goodwin, of Bath, on receipt of 3s. in postage stamps or post-office order.

THE BATH SABBATH PRIZE ESSAY.

Just Published, beautifully printed on fine paper, small 8vo., neat cloth, price 2s. 6d., or by post, free, for 3s.

THE CHIPPED JEWEL:

BEING A PRIZE ESSAY ON THE LORD'S DAY ;

Urging the Duty of preserving the same free from the Labour and Interruption of the Post Office Delivery, and of the Cheap Excursion Trains.

BY WILLIAM VEALE.

WITH A PREFACE BY THE ADJUDICATORS.

To the writer of this Essay the prize of £10 offered to the working men of Bath was awarded.

BATH : BINNS AND GOODWIN. LONDON : WHITTAKER AND CO.

Some of the Works

PUBLISHED BY

Binns and Goodwin, Bath,

SOLD IN LONDON BY

WHITTAKER & CO., A. HALL, VIRTUE, & CO.,

HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO., SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.

OLIVER AND BOYD, EDINBURGH.

And may be obtained, by order, of Booksellers in all parts of the Kingdom.

Messrs. BINNS and GOODWIN beg to state that the works contained in this Catalogue consist solely of books published by themselves. The Clergy, and other *visitors to Bath*, are respectfully invited to inspect their retail department, in which they constantly keep a select and valuable stock of the most modern works, more especially those of a religious character. They have also a choice assortment of Bibles, Prayer Books, Church Services, and Communicant's Companions, in plain and elegant bindings; and a large and attractive stock of Juvenile Books, of the most select and unobjectionable character.

Bath; 19, Cheap Street.

(Leading to the Abbey and Grand Pump Room.)

NOTICE.—*The Books contained in this Catalogue may be obtained in any part of the country, by order of a Bookseller. Should a difficulty occur, the publishers will be happy to forward any of the works, on receipt of the value in Postage Stamps or a Post-office order—Carriage free.*

For the convenience of Authors in the selection of suitable type for Works intended for Publication, Binns and Goodwin submit the following specimens of the most useful sizes, headed with the names of the type.

ENGLISH.

BINNS AND GOODWIN'S establishment has now existed nearly a century.

PICA.

They aim at the most perfect execution, either of ancient or modern style, plain or illuminated.

SMALL PICA.

However beautiful their productions, they strive to attain such a degree of elegance as will place their Books in an unrivalled position.

LONG PRIMER.

In Pictorial Publications they employ not the cheapest but the most experienced and eminent Artists; and also adopt a chaste and unique style of Binding, so essential to harmonise with nicely printed books.

BOURGEOIS.

BINNS AND GOODWIN have pleasure in being permitted to refer to the RELIQUÆ LITURGICÆ and FRAGMENTA LITURGICA, the former in five, and the latter in seven, volumes, 16mo., which they recently printed for the late Rev. PETER HALL, of Bath. These two works have circulated among a most respectable circle of subscribers; whose testimony concurs in pronouncing them equal to any thing of the kind of late years produced.

BREVIER.

"In common with other Works issuing from the press of MESSRS. BINNS AND GOODWIN of Bath, the book [*Ellen Seymour*] is beautifully printed, and illustrated by an ornamented Title-page, and a Frontispiece of more than ordinary merit."—*Extracted from a review by Mrs. Milner, the esteemed editor of the "English-woman's Magazine," and author of the "Life of Dean Milner," &c.*

NONPAREIL.

"The Bath Books" are well known, and BINNS and GOODWIN'S connexion with the most influential London, Country, American, and East India Booksellers, opens for them a wide field for the sale of their Publications.

Some of the Works

PUBLISHED BY

BINNS AND GOODWIN, BATH,

AND SOLD IN LONDON BY

WHITTAKER & CO., AND A. HALL, VIRTUE, & CO.

Michaelo and the Twins.

A Tale of the Lazzaroni in Naples. By AMALIE WINTER. With superior Engravings by Dickes. Imperial 16mo., elegant cloth, plain engravings, 4s. 6d.; cloth gilt, tinted engravings, 5s. 6d.; cloth gilt, and gilt edges, the engravings richly coloured in a novel style, 6s. 6d.

A Copy of this Book has been sent to the Great Exhibition.

"MESSRS. BINNS AND GOODWIN contribute to the GREAT EXHIBITION a Copy of MICHAELO AND THE TWINS, splendidly bound in blue watered silk,—the attractive novelty of the coloured Engravings (each of which goes through eleven distinct processes,) entitling it to that distinction."—*Publishers' Circular*, March 15, 1851.

"We have before us a work of much interest and instruction, illustrated most elaborately. Of the tale we desire to speak most favourably. The work deserves to, and will, we trust, be widely circulated; it is, as before observed, full of interest and instruction, and calculated to lead the youthful mind to a grateful acknowledgement of the blessed privileges an all-wise God has been pleased to confer on our happy land."—*Hereford Journal*, April 23, 1851.

"In the beauty of excellence and variety of the children's books is exhibited one of the literary triumphs of our age. *Maxima debetur pueris reverentia* was the sentiment of the ancient satirist; and it certainly has received a very practical illustration in the pains which are now bestowed upon the countless volumes of instruction and entertainment which are offered to the youth of the nineteenth century. Authors and artists vie with each other in the generous desire to gratify and cultivate the taste and discipline, and inform the minds of the young, who are thus tempted into the paths of knowledge by a thousand pleasant devices. But of all the books of this class which have yet come under our notice, MICHAELO AND THE TWINS is certainly the most attractive. Its literary pretensions are considerable. * * * The style is distinguished by clearness, simplicity, and grace; and in the course of the narrative, instruction and entertainment are very happily combined. * * * We have, at present, spoken only of the literary merits of this book; but it is for the illustrations which it contains that it is chiefly remarkable. They are engravings printed in colours, at the printing-presses of Messrs. Binns and Goodwin—and are admirable in design and execution. Not fewer than fourteen different shades and colours are employed; and the brilliancy of effect is equally novel and pleasing. They are curiosities in art; and we are not at all surprised that the book has found a place in the Great Exhibition. The title-page alone is a gem of decorative printing."—*Morning Post*, July 14th, 1851.

Louis' School-Days:

A Story for Boys. By E. J. MAY. Small 8vo., beautifully printed, very Elegant Cloth, with appropriate Emblematical Designs in Gold, embellished with several attractive Engravings by WILLIAMS. Price 6s.

"The doctrine I have endeavoured to maintain in the following pages is, that man being 'born in sin, a child of wrath,' has by nature all his affections estranged from God; that when by grace, through faith in Christ, a new life has been implanted within him, his affections are restored to their rightful Lord, every thought and imagination is brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ; and his whole being longs to praise Him who has called him 'out of darkness into light'—to praise Him 'not only with his lips, but in his life.' Then commences the struggle between light and darkness, between the flesh and the spirit, between the old and new man; and the results of this conflict are seen in the outward conduct of the Christian soldier."—*Preface*.

"Designed to illustrate and exemplify the gradual development of the Christian character, the growth and operation of Divine grace in the formation of that character, and the perils and temptations which beset even the most pious in their journey through life. The 'School-days of Louis' present a great variety of incident and character. Here a constant warfare is carried on between good and evil; for the religious school-boy is incessantly exposed to the greatest trials of his faith and holiness. The story is naturally and effectively told, and is calculated to encourage the young to persevere stedfastly in the path of Christian duty. No higher object than that can any man render to the community."—*Morning Post*, March 17, 1851.

"This is a very excellent book for boys at school. Some of the scenes are admirably described. There is a naturalness about the book we like exceedingly, and a good tendency from all its relations which cannot fail to benefit its readers. No boy can have it put into his hands, we think, without being deeply interested in it, and getting good out of it."—*Bible Class Magazine*, May, 1851.

"The boy has his difficulties, his failings, his trials, and his faults, and for a time it might seem as if the 'good seed' sown in his heart in childhood was effectually choked; eventually, however, it springs up and flourishes. The *School Trials* described in this work are such as must often fall to the lot of School-boys; indeed, the whole representation here given of School life is well calculated to be useful. The Author has carefully studied boyish character. The story is attractive, and will, we trust, be as useful, as it cannot fail to be interesting, to the class of readers for whom it is especially intended."—*Englishwoman's Magazine*, May 1851.

"The history of a school-boy appeals directly to the sympathies of school-boys and if it be written in the right spirit by one who can recal his own youth, describe its feelings, revive its joys and sorrows, and speak its language, there is nothing in literature more attractive. The present is just such a book; the story is of absorbing interest."—*London Journal of Literature*, May 4, 1851.

"This book details the history of a boy at a public school, in whose heart the seeds of Divine life have been planted, and who passes through bitter trials, arising not only from false accusation, but from waywardness of heart, the temptations from praise, fear, and shame, and the want of watchfulness and prayer. It is evidently written by one familiar with boys and schools, and is not wanting in graphic sketches of youthful wit, merriment, and mischief. Its moral lessons are excellent and the whole book is saturated with evangelical doctrine and precept."—*Christian Times*, June 21, 1851.

"A sketch of boarding-school life—its vexations and temptations, hopes and aspirations. The author has warm and deep sympathy with boyish feeling; and his pages are fitted to cultivate kindness of heart, manly integrity, and sound evangelical principle in his juvenile readers. It is surprising what intense interest the author casts around the affairs of the school-room."—*United Presbyterian Magazine*, 1851.

SEVENTH THOUSAND WITHIN A FEW MONTHS.

The Morning of Life: A Memoir of Miss A—n,
who was educated for a Nun; with many interesting particulars,
and Original Letters of Dr. DOYLE, late Roman Catholic Bishop
of Carlow. By her Friend M. M. C. M. Elegantly printed and
bound, with beautiful *Portrait, on India paper*. Small 8vo.,
cloth, price 3s. 6d.

"POSSESSES ALL THE CHARMS OF A ROMANCE, WITHOUT ITS HOLLOWNESS."—*Chris-
tian Times*.

"The spiritual progress of one who began amid the darkness of Popery, and,
guided by God's Spirit, groped her way out of darkness into light."—*Edinburgh
Christian Magazine*.

"Contains a practical refutation of the falsehood so frequently and confidently
put forth by Romanists."—*Achill Missionary Herald*.

"Its tone, its spirit, its style, are such as to render it worthy of a large circula-
tion."—*Gospel Magazine*.

"There are scenes in the book of striking interest and much beauty."—*Edinburgh
Evening Post*.

"A narrative invested with unusual interest."—*Christian Treasury*.

"A character most interesting and lovely. Will amply reward perusal."—*Free
Church Magazine*.

"Deeply interesting."—*Protestant World*.

"This very interesting and instructive Volume."—*Protestant Magazine*.

"The character of Miss A—n was no ordinary one."—*Protestant Magazine*.
SECOND NOTICE.

"Delineates very graphically the earthly career of one who died rejoicing in the
light of Protestant truth."—*Englishwoman's Magazine*.

"We commend this excellent work."—*Aberdeen Banner*.

"This Volume will well repay perusal."—*Church of England Magazine*.

"Fitted to touch the heart, and purify the feelings."—*Nonconformist*.

"A truthfulness and beauty which cannot fail to delight all readers."—*Liverpool
Courier*.

"Tells a tale which will touch many a heart."—*Christian Witness*.

"A most interesting account."—*Christian Guardian*.

"We wish we had space to follow this interesting history."—*Christian Guardian*.
SECOND NOTICE.

"We have been deeply interested."—*Evangelical Christendom*.

"Has an interest peculiar to itself. Her history is that of a most devout and
exemplary Christian."—*Edinburgh Advertiser*.

"An unaffected and true biography of one of those great and modest characters
who pass uncelebrated through the world, having won over themselves and it
that victory whose glory endures for ever."—*Dublin Warder*.

"Tracing with a pencil of light the spiritual progress of a very remarkable
mind."—*Dublin Warder*. SECOND NOTICE.

"Written in the most kindly and tolerant spirit, and cannot fail to be perused
with the greatest interest."—*St. James's Chronicle*.

"Exceedingly affecting. Many of the scenes related in the work are of surpass-
ing interest and beauty."—*Leamington Spa Courier*.

"The fine view it gives of the truly kind and noble nature of DR. DOYLE renders
it peculiarly valuable."—*Bible Class Magazine*.

"The memoir of a sweet Christian."—*Christian Cottager's Magazine*.

"Contains many highly instructive as well as interesting facts."—*Protestant
Witness*.

Some of the Works Printed and Published by BINNS AND GOODWIN, BATH :
And Sold by WHITTAKER and Co., and HALL and Co., London.

JUST PUBLISHED, UNIFORM WITH "THE MORNING OF LIFE."

Dedicated by permission

TO THE REV. NEWMAN HALL, B.A., Author of "COME TO JESUS," IT IS I,"
"THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHER TRIUMPHING OVER DEATH," &c.

My First Grief: or, Recollections of a Beloved Sister.

A Memoir and an Autobiography. By a Provincial Surgeon. In very Elegant gilt cloth, with beautiful portrait on India paper, admirably suited for a present, price 3s. 6d.

Contents.—Introductory and Historical.—Early Training.—Personal Characteristics.—My Change of residence.—Local Customs, Superstitions, and Peculiarities.—Our Clergyman; Cottage Lectures.—Family Pic-nics.—Our Pet Animals.—A Surgeon's Life in the Country.—Musical Evenings.—The Admiration.—Increased Mystery.—The Young Philosopher in Sickness.—Fatal Fulfilment.—Our Pastor's Visits.—The Musical Dream.—The Long Desired Portrait.—Chiefly Poetical.—After Reflections.—Grounds of Consolation.—Extracts from Correspondence—&c.

"The volume is of interest from its dedication to the Rev. Newman Hall, B.A., who, we believe, gives it his unqualified approbation. The religious purpose shown in every page is the mainstay of the book; while the affectionate, brotherly devotion everywhere apparent towards the much-loved object of the memoir, must command entire respect and sympathy. The volume may have been suggested by Tennyson's *In Memoriam*; both are the offshoots of a poetic temperament; and there is in both the same idea of commemorating virtue and worth. The style is gratefully fresh, simple, and unaffected. It will be read with advantage as an affectionate tribute, all the more eloquent from its simplicity."—*Eastern Counties' Herald*, Aug. 14.

"Throughout pervaded by that agreeable egotism which constitutes the charm of Leigh Hunt's writings. It is a book with which the young will be much pleased; and in which the severest critics will discover evidences of great ability. The Author's temperament is highly poetical. His book is a very delightful one."—*Hull Advertiser*, Aug. 15.

ALSO UNIFORM WITH "MY FIRST GRIEF," AND "THE MORNING OF LIFE."

Dedicated to the Rev. Hugh McNeile, D.D.

Falsehood and Truth.

By CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH. Beautifully printed, and elegantly bound, with Frontispiece (*The Poor Romanist's Last Hours*;) and Engraved Title page, price 3s. 6d.

"I believe, and because I believe therefore will I speak it, that this controversy [the Romanist,] is now become an indispensable branch of Christian education, seeing to what dangers the children of our people are exposed even within the social circle of private life; how much more in the comparatively unguarded range of schools, over-run with Romish teachers, and over-stocked with Romish books; and oh! how pre-eminently so, when sent forth to a foreign clime, there to inhale an atmosphere impregnated with the insidious poison of Popery! I might add that in the very sanctuary where they worship and where their fathers for generations past have enjoyed the blessings of a purely Protestant ritual, danger now lurks, the heterodox pulpit giving the lie to the orthodox desk; and the modes of communion table lapsing back into an altar fitted for idolatrous service. Dangers thicken around us; without are fightings, within are fears; may it be our daily study so to build ourselves up in our most holy faith, that neither the blustering storm roaring above, nor the insidious flood stealing on us from beneath, may shake our habitation, fixed on the immutable, everlasting Rock!"—*Dedication*.

UNIFORM WITH "FALSEHOOD AND TRUTH."

Our Little Study;

Or, Conversations on the Connection between the Law of Matter, the Law of Instinct, and the Law of Mind. By the Rev. T. FURLONG. Small 8vo., elegant cloth, price 3s. 6d.

"If any, who read this little volume, obtain more just perceptions of the goodness of Almighty God or be stimulated to love their precious Saviour better than before, the chief end of the publication will have been accomplished."—*Author's Preface*.

"Is an able contribution to juvenile libraries; and any young lady or gentleman who reads and inwardly digests the varied contents of this book will be both wiser and better."—*Christian Times*, June 7th, 1851.

"This book will well repay perusal. Every idea is made to tell an important practical truth."—*Church of England Magazine*, June, 1851.

UNIFORM WITH "OUR LITTLE STUDY."

Grace and Peace.

A Brief and Practical Summary of the Fundamental Doctrines of the Gospel. Elegant Cloth, price 3s. 6d.

"'GRACE AND PEACE' is a solid manual of sound theology. We very cordially recommend it as well fitted to ground young persons in the things which belong to their peace."—*Christian Witness*.

"This is really a very good book, setting forth the right mode of inquiring into the truths of revelation. The work may be classed with Booth's admirable treatise known as the 'Reign of Grace,' and 'Thomas Scott's Essays.'"—*British Banner*.

"This little book bears the mark of thoughtful reading among the productions of our best divines; and above all, of serious and prayerful study of the inspired volume. The writer has evidently a clear and experimental acquaintance with the 'truth as it is in Jesus,' and having experienced its healing and refreshing power, is anxious to bring others to drink of the 'living waters.' It is such a book as we should like to see in the hands of thousands."—*Christian Times*.

Some Passages in the Life of a Convert from Anglo-

Catholicism to the Truth as it is in Jesus. A Narrative of Facts. By R. C. J. Neat cloth, Super-royal 32mo., price 1s.

"This earnest book will surely tell where there is an ear to hear."—*The Prospect*.

"Impossible to read these remarkable 'Passages' without being convinced of the truth of the narrative."—*Englishwoman's Magazine*.

"This interesting narrative."—*Baptist Reporter*. SECOND NOTICE.

"We highly approve of and earnestly commend the book."—*Evangelical Mag.*

"Bears indelible marks of truthfulness. We strongly recommend this very interesting volume."—*Christian Advocate*.

"The description of the successive stages in the progress from darkness to light, is such as the subject of this experience alone could give."—*Christian Times*.

"I have read your really refreshing book three or four times. May God bless its temperate testimony."—*Letter from a Clergyman of the Church of England*.

Some of the Works Printed and Published by BINNS AND GOODWIN, BATH :
And Sold by WHITTAKER and Co., and HALL and Co., London.

THIRD THOUSAND.

Ellen Seymour ; or, the Bud and the Flower.

By MRS. SHEPHERD (formerly Anne Houlditch). *With Engraved Frontispiece and Vignette.* Small 8vo., elegant cloth, price 4s. 6d.; morocco, 8s. 6d.

"Needs no recommendation to ensure for it a cordial welcome among those who are alive to the signs and claims of the times."—*Protestant World*.

"An exceedingly interesting and well written tale."—*Evangelical Christendom*.

"The main design of this work seems to be, to exhibit and recommend the real doctrines of Scriptural Christianity, as opposed to the specious errors of Tractarianism. That design is carried out with considerable ability. In common with other works issuing from the press of Messrs. BINNS and GOODWIN, of BATH, the book is beautifully printed, and illustrated by an ornamental Title-page, and a Frontispiece of more than ordinary merit. 'ELLEN SEYMOUR, OR, THE BUD AND THE FLOWER,' will doubtless find numerous readers; *nor need one among them lay it down without having reaped some advantage from its perusal.*"—*Englishwoman's Magazine*.

UNIFORM WITH "ELLEN SEYMOUR." SECOND EDITION.

Katherine Douglas ; or, Principle Developed.

By S. SELBY COPPARD. Author of "Hadassah," "Jessie Barton," &c., &c. *With Engraved Frontispiece and Vignette.* Small 8vo., elegant cloth, price 4s. 6d.; morocco, 8s. 6d.

"The object of this tale is to show the paramount necessity of real, vital godliness, as distinguished from mere profession. The work is pleasingly written, and may be usefully placed in the hands of young persons."—*Church of England Magazine, August, 1850*.

"This volume, we feel assured, cannot fail of being very acceptable to every right thinking mind. It is beautifully printed, and is got out in a style which reflects high credit on the publishers and the capabilities of their printing establishment."—*Plymouth, Devonport, and Stouckhouse Herald, Oct. 26, 1850*.

"The narrative flows smoothly along, the incidents are varied and interesting, the characters naturally drawn, and the whole story reads like an actual narrative of real life. The book is got up in a style of elegant neatness both as regards typography and binding, and does great credit to the establishment of Binns and Goodwin. It is well adapted for a present to young persons just entering upon the anxieties and excitements of the world."—*Chester Courant, Nov. 6, 1850*.

The Religious World ;

Or, these Last Perilous Times. Demy 12mo., Neat Cloth, price 3s. 6d.

Introduction—The Religious World—Religious Intercourse—Evangelical Preaching and Reading—Religious Education—Religious Societies—Conclusion.

"Proneness to backsliding is the sad character of fallen man; and it has been painfully exemplified in England as well as in Israel. At various periods, with few exceptions, we seem to have become almost wholly secular, and worldly, and unbelieving; and the predominance of this secularity and unbelief, even still, is the grand danger of the Church of England—a far more serious danger than Popery Tractarianism, or Dissent."—*Bickersteth on the Promised Glory of the Church of Christ*

Helen Bury; or, the Errors of my Early Life.

By EMMA JANE WORBOISE, Author of "Alice Cunningham,"
"Maude Bolingbroke," &c. With Engraved Frontispiece and
Vignette. Small Svo., elegant cloth, price 4s. 6d.; morocco, 8s. 6d.

"We have great pleasure in introducing this highly interesting story to our readers. It is seldom indeed that we can so cordially recommend a work of the kind. The 'Errors of Early Life' in this volume are—leaving the doctrines of the Church of England for those of Puseyism and Roman Catholicism successively. Helen Bury is taught by severe earthly bereavements to know that 'the heart must rest on God alone'; and that there is only one Mediator by whom we can have access to the Father, and the blessings of everlasting life. She found that notwithstanding the formal observances and outward ceremonies of the new sect, the heart was cold and dead, and had no resting place in the time of trial and trouble, or at the hour of death. The incidents are beautifully connected and wrought out; the various characters are drawn with great vividness and skill, and only one who has felt the value of true religion could have so feelingly and truthfully depicted the impressions and workings of the mind. The style of the authoress is graceful and pure, and she possesses a keen sense of the beauties of natural scenery, in the description of which she excels. There is an indescribable charm in the touching and pathetic tone of many of the passages in the work. We think it calculated to do much good from the clear and simple manner in which the opinions on the 'Errors' are stated; and we have no doubt but that many who are 'halting between two opinions' will be confirmed and 'strengthened in their minds' as to the truth. We would fain have given an outline of the story, but rather advise our readers to procure the work for themselves."—*Dundee Courier*, Aug. 28, 1850.

"This is an agreeable tale illustrative of the errors of Romanism, which the heroine was led to embrace by having in the first instance attached herself to the lesser errors of Tractarianism. The characters and incidents of the story are well drawn, and the style is pleasing in a high degree. The hollow promises of Popery are piquantly set forth, and the vital truths of a pure Christianity ably stated. We conceive such tales as HELEN BURY are calculated to produce lasting impressions of the most wholesome kind upon the minds of the youthful, with whom stern truths are unpalatable unless presented in a pleasing dress. For this reason we must avail ourselves of the graces of language and the treasures of the imagination. We may add that the volume before us is a beautiful specimen of typography, reflecting much credit upon the publishers."—*Cheltenham Journal*, Sep. 2, 1850.

Popery; its Alliance with Paganism.

Translated from the French, by SENECA W. WINTER, Esq., of
Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Small Svo., cloth, with Engraved
Frontispiece (*A heathen priest offering sacrifice*;) price 2s. 6d.

"Calculated to illustrate the great truth, that Popery is merely a reproduction of the pagan worship."—*British Banner*.

"This very curious and interesting work has, we learn, in France been instrumental, under the Divine blessing, in effecting much good. Regarding this highly-interesting and able book as peculiarly calculated for extensive usefulness in this country at the present period, we, consequently, recommend it to the attention of all readers."—*Englishwoman's Magazine*.

"Mr. Winter has done a service to the cause of Protestantism in this country. The object is to establish the close affinity between Popery and Paganism; and the reader cannot fail to be satisfied in perusal that the writer's proof is at once original and effective."—*Edinburgh Christian Magazine*.

SECOND EDITION.

Wild Flowers and their Teachings.

Illustrated with Thirty-seven *Real Specimens*. In elegant cloth, price £1 1s.; silk, £1 5s.; velvet and morocco, £1 11s. 6d.

"Assuredly there is no pursuit which has the power this possesses,—to soothe and refresh the spirits of the sick and weary,—to cheer and interest the minds of the troubled and sorrowful; because every page of the BOOK OF NATURE may be read in harmony with the BOOK OF REVELATION,—both being written by the same ALMIGHTY HAND."—*Preface*.

Ocean Flowers and their Teachings.

By the Author of "Wild Flowers and their Teachings." Illustrated with Thirty-seven *Real Specimens* of Sea-weeds, Corallines, and Zoophytes. In 8vo. elegantly printed, and bound in silk, price £1 11s. 6d.; velvet, £1 15s.; morocco, £1 17s.

"In this beautiful book, as in the *Hortus Siccus* [Wild Flowers and their Teachings] above described, the real plants are presented; and no one, unacquainted practically with the botanical treasures of the deep, can have any idea how graceful and pretty many of these sea flowers are; as they are here *not depicted*, but actually given. The volume is a perfect gem of art and nature."—*Worcester Herald*.

"The title is delightful, and the whole appearance of the book most attractive. The author of 'Wild Flowers and their Teachings' has brought taste and ingenuity to aid the developments of science in a charming manner; and we know not which to admire most, her selections from the treasures of ocean, or the treasures of literature. The introductory chapter, which is itself a series of quotations, is skilfully managed so as to present us with some fascinating pictures and truthful sentiments. But the book, if book it may be called, is a curious innovation in the science of book-making; for not Nature's copy—not the highest efforts of art—the delicate engraving, or the still more delicate drawing—but Nature's self is here in unapproachable beauty. The graceful and varied Algae, the vegetable clothing of the mighty deep, the surpassing wonders of the race of Corallines—that beautiful link between the animal and vegetable world—are here set forth with taste and simplicity, together with specimens of Sponges and other Zoophytes. The specimens are mounted after the plan of an *Hortus Siccus*, only with greater care and effect; and each one is illustrated with 'elegant extracts,' both in prose and verse. The binding of this unique volume is varied, but principally presented to us in velvet and gold, such as will grace the drawing-room table. For a work, original only in its design, though so tasteful in execution, we have seen nothing like it, and predict it will be a prime favourite with all true lovers of Nature."—*Oxford Protestant Magazine*.

JUST READY, AN ELEGANT BOTANICAL WORK.

The Beauty of Flowers in Field and Wood.

By JOHN THEODORE BARKER, One of the Contributors of Flowers to "Wild Flowers and their Teachings." In a New Size of improved 8vo., handsomely printed, and embellished with a considerable number of *very attractive Coloured Engravings of Flowers by Dickes and Jerrard*. Appropriately bound, gilt edges, price 10s. 6d.

Natural Illustrations of the British Grasses;
their Botanical Characters, Properties, and Uses; with appropriate Readings: prefaced by an Original Poem by JAMES MONTGOMERY, Esq. Edited by FREDERICK HANHAM, M. R. C. S. L., and Corresponding Member of the Medico-Botanical Society of London. Illustrated with Sixty-two *Real Specimens*, carefully preserved and mounted. Forming a splendid volume, in small folio, suitable for the Library of the Connoisseur, the Study of the Agriculturist, and the Drawing-room Table of the Affluent. Price, in silk, £3; velvet, £3 8s.; morocco, £3 12s.

"This is a truly superb tome. It is externally a small folio, gorgeously clad in a coat of rich velvet and gold, and internally it presents the actual grasses of the field, plucked as they grew at seed-time in the meadows, and banks, and braes, dingles, and uplands of merry England. 'Seeing is believing,' it is said, and we should say that *this book, in its rare beauty and extraordinary richness, and yet chastity, must be seen to be believed.* Altogether, such a work is calculated to be the pet solace of the botanist's closet, and it must form an admirable souvenir to a friend of a botanical turn; while, as an object of material literary beauty, it can scarcely be rivalled in the wide range of British paper and print."—*Worcester Herald*.

"Perhaps in no country of the earth do grasses grow in such luxuriance and beauty as in Great Britain.

'Rich queen of mists and vapours,'

which descend upon her hills and vallies, fertilizing the lands, and keeping them ever fresh and green. The idea of collecting these exquisitely graceful productions into a published volume, consisting of *the dried grasses themselves*, instead of engravings from them, is a novel and a happy one; no copies, however skilfully made, could do justice to their tender and delicate forms. This idea has been admirably carried out in a book which, we believe, owes its origin to a provincial publishing firm; and wherein we find upwards of sixty specimens of British grasses, laid down with the utmost care, and with exceeding taste; presenting a work interesting to the botanist and lover of Nature, and *a folio*, where the artist and designer may study with undoubted advantage. The volume is one that must have entailed much cost in every way; we hope and believe it will repay the enterprise of the publishers. The specimens are accompanied by such botanical explanations as are necessary to instruct and interest; and by appropriate and judiciously selected extracts in prose and verse, from authors who have written upon the produce of the vegetable kingdom, and their influence on mankind."—*Art Journal*, July, 1851.

The beautiful copy shown at the Great Exhibition, (in its magnificent binding of morocco and gold, inlaid with vellum, in a glass show-case,) is for sale, price £12. Orders to be addressed to the publishers, BINNS AND GOODWIN, Bath. So splendid a volume for a present is rarely to be met with.

The Botanical Chart of British Flowering Plants
and Ferns; showing at one view their chief characteristics, Generic and Specific Names with the Derivations, their Localities, Properties, &c., &c., &c. Compiled by F. H. KNAPP. 8vo., cloth, price 6s.

"This is a prettily got up and carefully edited volume. Its contents are well arranged. Botany is a study possessing peculiar charms; its pursuit is at once an elegant, useful, and healthful occupation; and though no one insists on the necessity of a Linnaeus or a Lindley being found at every turn, yet all persons should know so much of the science as to be conversant with the names of the British flowering plants which bedeck the fields, and enliven the hedgerows. As far as books can impart such knowledge, it may be acquired from this volume without much difficulty, especially as it contains, in addition to the 'chart,' an index of the English or 'vulgar' names of the plants ordinarily met with in this country. A more useful and entertaining companion than this portable volume, during a rural ramble, is not easily found."—*Bath and Cheltenham Gazette*.

Notes and Reflections on the Epistle to the Romans.

By ARTHUR PRIDHAM. Demy 12mo., cloth extra, price 6s.

"To aid the progress of the simple reader whose desire is toward the truth of God it has alone been written. The reader who seeks for theological novelties in this work will search in vain, unless, indeed, truth be itself a new thing to his mind; while it is hoped that *no* reader who takes up the book for help, for comfort, for relief to an afflicted conscience, or for the refreshment of his memory in truths long valued, will find himself altogether disappointed."—*Preface*.

"Exhibits no small evidence of ripe study of the original text, and above all, is the production of one, sound on the great doctrine of justification by faith. The book has an humble, subdued, childlike tone, which will commend itself to the children of God; and there are none who can accuse the author of a spirit inconsistent with brotherly love. The volume may be read with advantage."—*The Christian Times*, April 26, 1851.

"The author is evidently a man of piety and good sense.....There are many valuable remarks to be found in the book."—*Church of England Magazine*, May, 1851.

"Under the above title is comprised a great amount of most precious truth and able criticism.....The tone and substance of the book are of a very superior kind."—*Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*, July, 1848.

"Mr. Pridham's object is not controversy, but edification, and to promote this every paragraph, to the best of his ability, has been made to bear. The book is one which bids fair to be useful to the Church of Christ, occupying a place distinct from all its predecessors, being in fact a book for everybody."—*Christian Witness*, August, 1851.

"We heartily commend this volume."—*Baptist Magazine*, July, 1851.

Past Fulfilment of Prophecy; a Guide to Future.

Small 8vo., cloth, price 1s. 6d.

* * The object of the above work is to show that Christians are warranted in expecting the same *real* and *literal* fulfilment of prophecy yet future, as has distinguished the past.

"The importance of its subject might well have claimed for this book an earlier notice at our hands. The author proceeds, with considerable ability, to discuss some of the commonly-received views respecting the interpretation of certain portions of the prophetic Scriptures; and, in particular, that view which regards the Pope or the Papacy as the "Antichrist" spoken of in the Sacred Oracles. He is the advocate of a *literal* interpretation of prophecy. The views to which we have alluded, as exhibited in this work, are set forth, not only with ability, but with moderation and Christian sobriety. They are, too, we believe, views which, more especially as it regards the future personal reign of the Messiah, are by no means peculiar to the author of the book under our consideration."—*Englishwoman's Magazine*, July, 1850.

"Things to Come."

By the REV. C. BOWEN, M.A., Incumbent of St. Mary's, Southwark. Small 8vo., cloth, price 1s. 6d.

I. The Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. II. The Coming of Jesus Christ, and the First Resurrection. III. The General Resurrection and Last Judgment.

"Very excellent, practical, and scriptural. It is another testimony added to the many now lifted up to proclaim the coming and kingdom of the Lord Jesus."—*Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*.

"A true picture of the subjects whereof it treats, interspersed with profitable practical hints to the reader."—*Prospect*.

A BEAUTIFUL BOOK FOR YOUTH. SECOND EDITION.

Dedicated by permission to the late Queen Adelaide.

The Works of Creation Illustrated.

By Mrs. BEST, Author of "The Parables," "The Old Testament Histories," &c. *With coloured Arabesque Frontispiece and Title, and several Engravings.* Elegant cloth, price 4s. 6d. Morocco, 8s. 6d.

"The title as fitly serves to tell the contents of this volume as we could do by a column of letter-press. The Divine work of the six days, all that it effected and produced, is told with admirable talent, and with clever brevity—the latter being a merit very rarely met with. The illustrations are worthy of the work, which deserves a place in the libraries of all readers who have reached their *teens*."—*Church and State Gazette*.

"This pleasingly written volume is well adapted for young persons."—*Church of England Magazine*.

"The elegant volume for which we are indebted to Mrs. BEST, tells usefully and eloquently of the Divine work of the six days, its purpose and its consequences. The Authoress has accomplished her task with great ability, and has produced a work eminently adapted to the young. We may add, that the illustrations are in very good taste."—*Church of England Quarterly Review*.

"We can recommend this volume as calculated to interest the young in Nature."
—*Edinburgh Christian Magazine*.

"This is a splendid work upon the mightiest of subjects. The authoress has swept through air, earth, and ocean, reporting upon all the great facts which presented themselves, with simplicity, beauty, and devotion. The illustrations are among the best that ever appeared in such publications, and are such as become a work which has received the patronage of a British Queen. We cordially recommend it; it is got up in a sumptuous manner."—*British Banner*.

The Family of Glencarra.

A Tale of the Irish Rebellion. By SIDNEY O. MOORE, Author of "Annie Grey," "Voice of the New Year," &c. *With several fine Engravings by Williams and Measom.* Small 8vo., elegant cloth, price 4s. 6d.

"Intended to illustrate some of the popular superstitions of Ireland. The design is good, the style is clear and simple, the whole is pervaded by a spirit of earnest piety, which shows a just appreciation at once of the source of Ireland's woes, and the only remedy by which these can be met. Several interesting examples are given of the effects of the Scripture-readers' labours in Ireland, and the opposition these excite among the Roman Catholic priesthood. The 'Family of Glencarra' is sure to be a favourite."—*Christian Times*, Feb. 22nd, 1851.

"An elegantly got up, simple, but interesting tale, the scene of which is laid in the times of the Irish Rebellion. It contains some well-drawn characters. The feeling is good."—*Hereford Times*, Feb. 22nd, 1851.

"An interesting little work; endeavouring, by touching passages of *real life*, to show the prevailing ignorance and superstition of the Irish Roman Catholic peasantry, and the call there is to send them the Bible and the Gospel light in their own dear Irish."—*Protestant Magazine*, March 1st, 1851.

"We heartily commend it."—*Gloucestershire Chronicle*, March 22nd, 1851.

"A little book containing many interesting illustrations of Irish character."
—*Evangelical Christendom*, April, 1851.

"We hope many of our readers will peruse this very striking 'Tale of the Irish rebellion' for themselves. The work is remarkable for the beauty of its typography, and for the number and excellence of its pictorial illustrations."—*English-woman's Magazine*, April, 1851.

Ambition; or, the History of the Witheringtons.

By A. COURTENAY NEWTON. Author of "The Days of Land," "Mary Spencer," "Ridley Seldon," &c. Small 8vo. *With Exquisite Frontispiece and Title.* Elegant cloth, price 3s. 6d.

"This is a very well-intentioned book, with much to interest and many lessons of Scriptural truth faithfully inculcated."—*Church of England Magazine*, Feb., 1851.

"We can scarcely say more in its favour than that it is calculated under the Divine blessing effectually to remind young readers that the best book which they can write for others is that 'living epistle known and read of all men'—A HOLY LIFE."—*Englishwoman's Magazine*, May, 1851.

Holiday Rambles; or, Peeps into the Book of Nature. By ELIZABETH GRANT. *With Six highly finished Engravings by George Measom.* Demy 16mo., elegant cloth, price 3s. 6d.

"It is the earnest wish of the writer that those who read these pages may experience the same delight in contemplating the wonderful works of God which she has felt while enjoying a quiet ramble in the lovely lanes and woods that abound in this our beloved and beautiful country."—*Preface*.

Pictures from French History. A Fireside Amusement. *With Six Superior Coloured Engravings by George Measom.* Elegant cloth, price 2s. 6d.

"The illustrations are of a very superior description, and make the volume extremely acceptable to those who are led by 'pretty pictures' to explore the regions which are sealed, until a knowledge of reading opens the portals. The design is to convey a knowledge of French History by means of painting verbal pictures, and those who guess aright have themselves to put a pictorial question. The idea is novel. We recommend the production."—*Historic Times*.

Annie Grey; or, the Experience of a Week.

A Story for Children. By SIDNEY O. MOORE. Author of "The Family of Glencarra," &c. *With Engraved Frontispiece.* Elegant illuminated cover. Demy 16mo., price 1s.

"Annie Grey learned by experience, during her week of trial, the weakness of her own heart, and the impossibility of walking in the narrow way without help from above; and she learned to seek and prize that Divine guidance which is so freely offered to all, but which few choose to accept. Thus she became a sincere follower of Christ."—*Page 44*.

"An interesting and useful little book. Annie Grey is a naughty little girl, full of self-conceit and self-dependence; who fancied she could live faultlessly whenever she pleased. A week was given her to try; but though every day warnings were uttered and texts given for guidance, she every day failed, and came to the week's end, having only learned her own weakness and folly. The story will do good to little boys and girls who are apt to think too highly of themselves, and will read to them good lessons."—*Bible Class Magazine*, April, 1851.

"A very useful present to a little girl who does not understand her own heart."—*Mother's Friend*, May, 1851

In soliciting the attention of Authors to their Establishment, BINNS & GOODWIN have pleasure in referring to the sub-joined testimony of the press of England, Ireland, and Scotland, to the style of their work, the capabilities of their press, and the advantages of their mode of publication.

From a Review of 'Ellen Seymour,' in the "Protestant World."

"The enterprising house of Messrs. Binns and Goodwin, of Bath, has secured an honourable position among provincial publishers, not only for the valuable publications which have issued from their press, but also for the peculiar facilities they afford to Authors to publish works, which, though they have cost them a large amount of time and talent, they might be unable to produce unless thus guaranteed against pecuniary risk. This feature in their business arrangements enhances their claims on public support."

From a Review of 'Daily Meditation,' in the "Christian Witness."

"This is the most elegant and tasteful thing of the kind that has yet appeared, and does much credit to the press of Messrs. Binns and Goodwin."

From a Review of 'Katherine Douglas,' in the "Chester Courant."

"It is got up in a style of elegant neatness, both as regards typography and binding, and does great credit to the establishment of Messrs. Binns and Goodwin."

From a Review of 'Katherine Douglas,' in the "Plymouth Herald."

"It is beautifully printed, and is got out in a style which reflects high credit on the publishers, and the capabilities of their printing establishment."

From a Review of 'Helen Bury,' in the "Edinburgh Witness."

"Another of the admirable series of tales now publishing by the enterprising firm of Binns and Goodwin, of Bath."

From a Review of 'Helen Bury,' in the "Englishwoman's Magazine."

"The book exhibits the beauty of typography and illustration which usually distinguishes the publications of Messrs. Binns and Goodwin."

From a Review of 'Popery: its Alliance with Paganism,' in the "Englishwoman's Magazine."

"In whatever relates to execution and external appearance it deserves to be distinguished even among the beautifully finished publications of Messrs. Binns and Goodwin."

From a Review of 'Morning of Life,' in the "Aberdeen Banner."

"The work is beautifully got up by its enterprising publishers."

From a Review of 'Morning of Life,' in the "St. James's Chronicle."

"The book, which issues from the press of Messrs. Binns and Goodwin, of Bath, is elegantly printed, and is illustrated by a beautiful portrait."

From a Review of 'Katherine Douglas,' in the "Leamington Courier."

"We know of no provincial publishers who have contributed more to the advancement of sound religion by the dissemination of books of a similar tendency to those we have just noticed, than Messrs. Binns and Goodwin, of Bath, all of whose publications are not only distinguished by their high literary excellence, but also by their superior typographical accuracy and taste."

BINNS AND GOODWIN,

PUBLISHERS AND PRINTERS, BATH,

RESPECTFULLY invite the attention of the Clergy, and Authors, to their Establishment for PRINTING and PUBLISHING. In the execution of works confided to their care, they feel assured they can offer real advantages, both in the mechanical department, and in competent literary assistance. It will also be their study to make such efforts as will promote a ready and an extensive sale.

B. & G. have much satisfaction in referring to the numerous works issued from their Establishment during a period of nearly a century; and more especially to their recent publications, some of which, of a perfectly unique character, they can confidently compare with the productions of any Press in the kingdom: while, by the continual addition to their carefully-selected *matériel*, of modern improvements and facilities, they are prepared to undertake any description of Book-Printing, in the most correct and elegant style.

Having also directed their attention very considerably to the higher order of pictorial embellishments, and employing Artists of first-rate ability, B. & G. will be happy to undertake the preparation and publication of Illustrated works in the first style of the art.

ESTIMATES FOR PRINTING IN ENGLISH, LATIN, GREEK, HEBREW,
OR OTHER LANGUAGES, FORWARDED ON APPLICATION.

MUTUAL AND EQUITABLE PUBLISHING.

BINNS & GOODWIN beg to acquaint the Literary Public that they undertake the Printing and Publishing of New Works, (*i. e.* of real merit) on condition of 250 copies being taken, without any risk to the Author either in Advertising or remaining unsold copies,—and divide the profits of the whole Edition with the Author.

The object aimed at in this system of Publishing is to enable Authors to introduce their works before the Public without incurring a large and uncertain outlay—ensuring, at the same time, through a ready sale, which may be expected for works of real merit and interest, a due reward for their labours.

To enable the Author to realize an immediate benefit, 20 per cent. less than the publishing price of the book will be charged on the 250 copies: *e. g.*—for a book the price of which is 10s. only 8s. will be charged to the Author, and so on in proportion—and the profit on *his own purchase* of 250 copies and upwards, will be included in the ultimate division. All purchases above 250 copies will be charged 30 per cent. less than the published price.

It is also submitted, that Authors who prefer publishing by *Subscription* will find this mode present peculiar advantages, as it at once determines the amount of profit.

The facilities of communication, and convenience for transmitting proofs, being now so great as to render distance of little importance, as long experienced by B. & G., their publications being the labours of Authors throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland, they respectfully offer their services to Authors resident in *any part of the Kingdom*, to Print Books, Pamphlets, Hymn-Books for Churches and Chapels, and Periodicals, with accuracy, elegance, and promptitude.



1 1012 01003 2029

